The Forum

APRIL, 1895.

THE REAL "QUINTESSENCE OF SOCIALISM."

A SHORT treatise on Socialism has been recently published in English, which is translated from the original German of a very celebrated man. Its title is "The Quintessence of Socialism," and its author is Dr. Schäffle. The interest of the book is twofold. It is partly the interest which the author intended it should possess: it is partly an interest which was certainly neither designed by him nor desired. The former depends on what he says. The latter, which is even more striking, depends on what he omits to say.

Let me first deal briefly with what Dr. Schäffle says. He is, let it be remembered, a man who, in a certain sense, speaks on the subject with an exceptional if not unique authority. He has devoted to the study of Socialism many years of his life. He is a complete master of its literature, or at all events the most important parts of it. He has had every opportunity of observing the character and the aims of its leaders in the country where, both intellectually and practically, it has reached its highest development; and, although he has approached it as a critic rather than as a convert, he is a critic who has sought to discover its essential strength, not to discredit it by obtruding its accidental weaknesses.

Such being the case, he begins by dwelling upon the fact that Socialism to the world at large is a somewhat confusing thing, because there are many writers and parties who all claim to be socialistic, but who yet differ and quarrel among themselves almost as vivaciously as they quarrel with the common foe, and convict each other—no doubt with justice—of all kinds of absurdities. But beneath all these differences, beneath all these absurdities, Dr. Schäffle

Copyright, 1894, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

points out that there is a certain foundation of agreement—certain common ideas or doctrines; and that these last differ from the former in two most important ways. In the first place they are the ideas and doctrines which alone are really essential to Socialism; they are the common root, morally and intellectually, of all its conflicting developments. And in the second place, whatever absurdity may be found in such developments, these ideas and doctrines from which they spring are not absurd in themselves. They may be wrong or right; or partly one, partly the other: but if wrong they are wrong in a grave and reasonable way; and they offer us a *prima facie* case for grave and careful examination. They cannot be disposed of by a laugh, or a facile sarcasm.

He accordingly proceeds to point out in detail that the more extreme doctrines of the Socialists, the doctrines which appeal most easily to the imagination of the ordinary public, have no necessary connection with the essence of Socialism whatever. He shows, for instance, that the position of Socialism with regard to private property is very different from the idea popularly formed of it; and that it does not of necessity tend to deprive the individual of his house, of his chattels, of an adequate private income, of freedom to spend it, of a limited freedom to save it, and even of a limited freedom to bequeath his savings to others. The whole essence of Socialism, or, as Dr. Schäffle calls it, the "quintessence," he shows to be comprised in the doctrine that Society should, as a whole, acquire possession not of all private property, but of a specific part only; and that part is not income but capital, not the products but merely the means of production. The socialistic revolution carried to its logical conclusion would merely turn the whole community into a single manufacturing and trading company, in which each citizen would be a wage-earning or salaried employee. No citizen would be allowed individually to own any of the means either of manufacture or exchange, any more than an English officer to-day is allowed to become a shareholder in Gibraltar or in the Portsmouth dock-yard. But every citizen would be allowed to spend his salary as freely as an English officer does now, and to save it as freely. There would be this difference only: his savings would bear no interest; they would virtually be put into a stocking.

Such is the sketch of Socialism which Dr. Schäffle offers to his readers, as a substitute for the popular caricatures which conceal its real nature; and his opinion is that when seen, as he thus represents

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it—and his representation thus far is entirely just—it at once appears as an idea, a doctrine, a scheme which may indeed be open to the attacks of circumstantial criticism, but which does not contain any far-reaching and fundamental errors, the exposure of which will at once be fatal to the entire fabric.

His own criticisms illustrate this opinion. They are minute, tentative, timid, almost apologetic. Many of them are keen and searching to a very high degree; but the keenest and most searching are precisely those that illustrate most clearly the author's hesitating attitude. He seems indeed to have no conception how far his own criticisms go. He chips the crust of socialistic teaching, and having done so remains content with showing us that he has made an aperture as big as a mouse's hole. He never realizes himself, or cares to show his readers, that the mouse's hole is the entrance to a whole cavern of difficulty.

His main criticisms are these: He points out that Socialism, as at present conceived by its advocates, reposes on the crude and puerile theory of Karl Marx, according to which all value depends on labor, and the value of all labor depends on, and must be measured by, time; and he shows this to be false by emphasizing two obvious facts—first, that the utility of a commodity and the demand for it at any given moment have an influence on its value which is altogether independent of the antecedent circumstances of its production; and second, that the kinds of labor involved in, and necessary to, the production of it vary greatly in their importance, and in the rarity or commonness of the faculties required for performing them. He points out also that were the state the universal capitalist and employer, and all the citizens its employees living on wages, the calculation of the wages due to each employee, let the value of his labor be determined on what basis we will, would involve an amount of calculation and bookkeeping, the like of which has never been seen hitherto, and which seems to the ordinary judgment altogether impracticable. Finally, he points out that the efficacy of all collective labor depends on the manner in which it is directed and controlled; and that, were a whole nation converted into a single firm which manufactured and distributed everything and had to find remunerative employment for every one, the business of direction would not only be as important as it is now, but incalculably more difficult; and he declares it to be very doubtful whether a socialistic state would be able to find men capable of undertaking it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Each of these points is put clearly enough by Dr. Schäffle; but the curious thing is that he realizes but a small part of their force. He does not see that they are virtually all one—that they are but so many incomplete and feeble ways of expressing the single great underlying fact which has made Socialism impossible ever since the beginning of the world, and which stands in the way of its ever being possible in the future. This great fact is that men are exceedingly unequal in their faculties, in the keenness of their intellect, in the strength of their desires, and in the vigor of their character. In all states of society this inequality has made itself felt. The men who have been strongest in the special kind of strength most needed by the community at any given period have always led the others; and the fortunes of the masses have risen and fallen with the fortunes and the greatness of their leaders. And, if this is true of societies in any stage of their development, more especially and emphatically is it true of societies whose prosperity is based, like that of our modern civilized countries, on trade and manufacture—on the production and exchange of goods. The wealth of a community, even more than its military strength, depends on the influence of the gifted few over the many. I have lately, in various writings, been endeavoring to impress on the public what, broadly speaking, are the respective parts which the few and the many play in producing wealth. The many contribute what is commonly called Labor: the few contribute what I have specifically called Ability; and the essential difference between the two, as I have pointed out, is this—Labor is the exertion of a man concentrated on some single task, such as minding some particular machine, riveting some particular rivet, stoking some particular furnace: Ability is the exertion of a man which, whether it take the shape of mechanical invention, scientific discovery, the conduct or organization of a business, or the inception of some new enterprises, affects an indefinite number of laborers, either modifying the tasks which they are set to do, or supplying them with some new aid in doing them. The entire increase in our powers of wealth-production is due to the concentration of exceptional human talent, in the form of industrial ability, or the various productive processes. Collective labor, measured by time, supplies us not with any measure of the actual value of the product, but at best with the unit of such value. The actual value is this unit multiplied by Ability.

This truth is really at the bottom of all Dr. Schäffle's criticisms. He realizes, though in an incomplete way, that the value of collective

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor—its efficiency in satisfying the wants of the laborers themselves—depends on the way in which it is directed by the Ability of the few. But he does not make the distinction between the two kinds of faculty sufficiently clear to himself. Had he done so, the several incidental difficulties which he sees in the socialistic scheme would have resolved themselves into one radical difficulty; and he would have seen what he has failed to see, its true nature. Its true nature is expressed in the following question: Would a socialistic state, without ceasing to be socialistic, be able to offer to the specially gifted few sufficient motive, in the shape of reward, to induce them to develop and apply their special gifts with an energy equal to that with which they develop and apply them now? At present their reward, or in other words the efficient motive, is, first, the primary income they are allowed to appropriate, not out of defrauded labor, but of the increment added to the results of labor by their own direction of it; and, second, the secondary income, or the interest, that they are allowed to take from that part of their primary income which they set aside as capital. Now this secondary income, as Dr. Schäffle emphatically points out, would be absolutely and entirely taken from them by the socialistic state; and the primary income, though not taken from them entirely, would be reduced to a sum not only completely insignificant, but having no approximate equality to the value of their productive effort.[1]

And this consideration brings us to what is really the quintessence of Socialism. The quintessence of Socialism is not to be found in the proposal to substitute the state for the private employer or capitalist. This is merely the shell of the quintessence, not the kernel. The kernel is the proposal to reduce, to an indefinite degree—indeed, practically to extinguish—the existing motive to the exercise of certain exceptional powers, which, in a socialistic state, would be just as essential as at present, and yet to secure their exercise in all its present intensity. A man at present toils night and day in creating or directing some great industry, and as a reward has a palace,

[1] Socialistic writers, with a truly astonishing folly, attempt to weaken the force of the above facts by representing an immense part of the wealth of the capitalist classes as having no connection with production at all, but being merely disguised theft, accomplished through the agency of the stock exchange. They fail to see that this would account merely for the transference of a certain part of this national income, but would not increase the total, whereas the great fact of modern industrial history is the increase of the total product, relatively to the population among whom it is produced.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a picture gallery, and a yacht. Were the state suddenly socialized, this man, or some one exactly like him, would be continued in precisely his present position and authority and asked to perform exactly the same functions. The only difference would be that his palace and his yacht would be taken from him, and his utmost hopes cut down to a six-roomed villa, which would differ very little, as Dr. Schäffle informs us, from the house of the stupidest and least efficient of the laborers, whose labor, but for himself, would hardly be worth anything. This is the difference from the existing system, which is really the quintessence of Socialism; and the fundamental question on which the practicability of Socialism turns is simply this question of whether able men as a class would continue to develop and exert their faculties as they do now when nearly all the motives which cause their activity now, and which have caused it since the beginning of civilization, are carefully and deliberately, if not vindictively, annihilated.

It is not my intention here to answer this question in one way or the other. All I wish to note is that this is the crucial question; and that it is precisely the question which one of the ablest and best instructed critics of contemporary Socialism in Europe has most completely neglected, when attempting to reduce Socialism to its quintessence.

I mention Dr. Schäffle thus, because he is one of the most instructive examples possible of the defective condition of thought with regard to modern social problems which prevails even among thinkers of the highest and most distinguished kind. And I am now going to show, using Dr. Schäffle once more as an example, how completely the imperfection of thought I have just criticised runs through and vitiates all the practical calculations which are made as to the actual position and the practical prospects of Socialism. Dr. Schäffle says:

> "The Socialistic scheme deserves consideration as a practical and practicable proposal, because of the rapidity with which it is enlisting supporters, and still more because of the energy and the conduct of these supporters when enlisted. . . . They constitute a party which surpasses many other parties in fiery zeal, in inspiration, in the faith that removes mountains, in strength of organization, and in international expansion—a party which is ever gaining proselytes, and which faces the future in confident expectation of victory."

And the same language is used not only by the Socialists themselves, but by many of their alarmed opponents. The alleged increase of converts to the socialistic faith and their organization as a political

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

body are accepted by both sides as a proof that, for good or ill, the socialistic scheme is one which may some day be actually realized; and each numerical accession of strength to the cause is supposed to bring the possibility of this realization nearer.

What I desire to point out is that this entire argument rests on a radically imperfect conception of what the socialistic problem is. It rests on and it flows from a failure, like Dr. Schäffle's, to push the analysis of it far enough, and to see that the classes of men with which Socialism professes to deal are divided not only by the accidental fact that some men possess capital and some do not, but by the fact that some possess exceptional faculties and some do not, and that the former are just as essential to the success of Socialism as the latter. When once this fact is recognized, the numerical spread of Socialism will appear before us in a very different light, and we shall see that it is necessary to inquire not only into the number of the proselytes, but also into their industrial talents, as exhibited in their lives hitherto. Now it is always dangerous to make any general assertion, without allowing at the same time that there may be isolated exceptions to its truth. But, allowing for such exceptions, it happens to be a broad fact that, alike among its rank and file and its leaders, the converts of Socialism belong, all of them, to one class; and that is the class which, whatever its other qualifications, does not possess the faculty of industrial ability—that is to say, one of the faculties essential to the socialistic state. Let me make my meaning as to this point quite clear. Socialism numbers among its exponents many men of strong mental powers, of wide research, and generous sympathies; but it has, allowing for very rare exceptions, made no way whatever among men who possess the power, no matter in what form, of increasing the productivity of industrial exertion as a whole or even of maintaining the productivity that pertains to it at the present moment. In England, for instance, some of the so-called "labor-leaders" are no doubt excellent workmen in their own trades; but there is not a man among them who has shown any capacity for organizing laborers so that their labor may be efficient *in production;* still more notorious it is that there is not one who has been able to increase its efficiency. The sole exception to this rule in England is Mr. William Morris, the poet. He is the head of a firm of printers and upholsterers which aims at introducing into modern production something of the spirit of mediæval craftsmanship. But Mr. Morris's case is for many reasons an exceptional one. He works less in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spirit of a producer of goods than of an artist; the goods he produces are, owing to his methods of production, merely beautiful luxuries for the richest among the very rich—carpets and curtains of the softest and deepest pile, and volumes bound in vellum and printed on hand-made paper, the cheapest and smallest of which costs something like eight dollars. Mr. Morris's methods of doing business moreover bear, to all appearance, a singular resemblance to the business methods of other firms: in exhibiting his wares he deliberately suppresses all mention of the men under him, whose labor has assisted in their production; and his masterpieces of printing are announced by him as having been printed by "me, William Morris." The Continent may perhaps supply us with a few cases of Socialists who have shown some of the qualities essential to the captain of industry; but such cases are as exceptional as that of Mr. Morris himself, and are as little representative of Socialism applied to the ordinary business of production. Such cases may be altogether put aside. They do nothing to disprove or to modify the truth of the general proposition that Socialism has practically made no converts whatever among the class of men who are competent to direct industry. There are Socialists who possess every gift of organization except that of organizing the production of the wealth which they desire to distribute.

And not only do the Socialists, as a body, happen to be without this gift, but the intellectual temperament which distinguished the most gifted of them is a temperament which owes its strength to the fact of this gift being absent. Every advance that has been made in the process of production and all successful production on a large scale at the present moment have been and are due to the exercise of faculties concentrated in some single circumscribed object, and motived to activity by some personal ambition, definite and intense because of its narrowness. In a lofty and generous spirit, or else in a mean and selfish one, those possessed of these faculties have worked to construct some exceptional fortune for themselves. The typical Socialist, on the contrary, disclaims, and no doubt with sincerity, any such desire for a lot that is beyond the reach of the great majority of mankind.

This fact has been illustrated in a very curious way by a number of books and essays which have appeared lately in England, describing the kind of life which commends itself to the taste and imagination of the middle-class Englishman who has imbibed the teachings of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Socialism. The writers of these books and essays declare themselves incapable of appreciating any of the advantages bestowed by a large private fortune, and express an intense antipathy to all those conventionalities and restraints which have invariably distinguished the lives of all rich societies. One of these writers pours contempt on a civilization which prevents a man from promenading Piccadilly in any fantastic costume that may happen to please his fancy; another declares that any kind of life is slavery which prevents him from sitting down to dinner in a flannel shirt, from shouting to his friends in the street, or squatting down to rest himself like a tramp on any inviting door-step. In another place we are told by a typical middle-class Socialist that the refinements of cookery give no real pleasure to the palate, and that a single big dish of rice or lentils, followed possibly by some fruit, forms his own ideal of the most delightful banquet possible. The same writer deplores that servants, instead of being a luxury, are an infliction; and that, when he is staying in the houses of his well-to-do friends and relations, he is miserable because he is not allowed to black his own boots. Again, in a book written apparently by a man and his wife in conjunction, the writers having described their own small establishment, and, having declared that even this was beyond what they really wanted, go on to say that not only is the desire for luxury altogether illusive, but also the desire for fame and personal distinction of any kind; and they suggest as a practicable reform that all poets, philosophers, artists, and men of genius generally shall so far as possible perform their work anonymously.

Now the kind of life which such persons conceive of as desirable is a kind of life for which very much may be said; it is capable of being represented, both on its material and its moral side, in picturesque and attractive colors; and many men may from the bottom of their hearts think it preferable to the life of wealth. But the men who think this are not the men to whom the material progress of the world at large has been due. They may include in their number, very possibly, great thinkers or even great scientific discoverers; but they do not include in their number the men who have dragged down science from heaven, and forced it to perform those minute and menial services by which alone the material wealth of the modern world has increased. The electric telegraph and the use of gas for illumination were discovered by philosophers a century before they benefited the world at large; but the men who applied these two dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coveries practically were men who in character and temperament differed entirely from the discoverers. Their ambitions, their aims, their methods may, from the socialistic point of view, have been infinitely lower, narrower, and more selfish, than those of Socialists; but they happened to possess what the Socialists do not, the power to produce those improved industrial conditions, in which the most modest Socialist desires to have his own modest share.

One of the most constant themes of the socialistic writer is the vastness of the powers which invention and applied science have placed at the service of the human race; and they demand that these powers should be used for the equal benefit of all, so that no one may possess much more than his neighbor, and all may possess a humble but refined competence. But they wholly overlook the way in which these powers have been acquired. They have been acquired solely by the exertions of a class of men who have found in a humble, but refined, competence no attraction whatever, but who, in their efforts to increase the productive powers of man, have been motived by an imperious desire to construct for themselves an exceptional future, as the natural and just reward of their own exceptional services. The Socialists also overlook the equally important fact that the powers which they describe as being at the service of the human race are powers of a kind so complicated and so elusive that they are retained in the service of the human race at all only by the keenest and most constant supervision on the part of men precisely similar in character to those by whom these powers were originally conferred upon the world. One of the most signal examples of this oversight is supplied us by Karl Marx, who, in spite of the diligence with which he studied the existing industrial system, takes actually no account of the faculties by which the productivity of labor has been increased or by which it is maintained, and treats all men as if their temperaments, motives, and faculties were absolutely identical.

The Socialists, then, have been, and up to the present moment are, people in this condition: They are people whose intellectual ingenuity and whose moral zeal aim at inaugurating a new division of an income, the increase and even the maintenance of which depend on faculties which they none of them possess themselves, and on the force of ambition and motives to which they profess themselves to be entire strangers.

As I have already indicated, I have no wish here to question the genuineness and unselfishness of their zeal for the public good. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must, however, be observed with regard to the middle-class Socialists of England, that they are almost all of them men whose fortunes are of the most moderate kind. In the revolution which they advocate, they would themselves lose little; and almost the whole of the wealth which they desire to redistribute is the wealth of a class or of classes to which they do not belong, whose manners and customs they most of them know only from a distance, and whose position it is quite evident that they envy, even though they may not wish to occupy it. Indeed, one of the best known of our English Socialists has admitted this fact, in a very frank and a very naïf way. He has remarked, in a certain volume of socialistic essays, that one of the main motives which will aid in the spread of Socialism is the extraordinary pleasure people find in doing good, when the good they do is altogether at the expense of their neighbors. I mention this fact because the significance of the spread of Socialism among the middle class has to be discounted by taking it into consideration, since the pleasure of doing good at the expense of others is a pleasure which would soon be made impossible by the very system whose advent it is alleged to hasten. This, however, is by the way. The main point which I am urging on the attention of the reader is the fact that the most educated, the most intellectual, the most elevated classes of men on whom Socialism thus far has made any impression, or who have themselves used their talents to recommend it to the world at large, have been (let us attribute to them what sincerity we will) men wanting in that all-important faculty by which the amount of wealth in any modern community is determined, and without which no modern civilization could continue to exist at all.

And if this is true of such Socialists as are to be found among the middle classes, much more obviously is it true of those who are recruited from among the manual laborers, and who are specifically represented by such bodies as Trade-Union Congresses. It is a notorious fact that not a single member of these Congresses in England represents any of the faculties by which labor is directed productively, and the efficacy of labor increased. The members are laborers, pure and simple, though many of them may be skilled and excellent laborers; and they are men who one and all of them have emphatically failed to do anything, be it never so little, to assist their fellow-laborers, by organizing their industry, by directing it to more profitable ends, by supplying it with new methods and machines, or indeed by performing any one of those functions on the performance of which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the very existence of collective labor depends. Other laborers do what these men fail to do. They show powers not only of laboring, but of directing labor. But these men are not found in Trade-Union Congresses. They continue to rise, as such men have risen hitherto. They create capital, they invest capital, they become employers and capitalists; and, still animated by the old immemorial motives, they enrich the world in the process of securing riches for themselves. Among all the men who are so voluble about dividing fortunes, there is not a single man who has shown himself able to make a fortune.

Thus, while the business of collective production in a socialistic or any other community requires the coöperation of two forms of exertion and of two sets of men, the spread of Socialism has been confined to one set exclusively. The modern process of production, taken as a whole, may be compared to a picture, painted on canvas which is stretched on a wooden frame. The picture cannot exist at all without the canvas; but its value depends not on the canvas-maker, or the frame-maker, but on the artist. In the same way the value of the products of collective industrial exertion, although without labor there would be no products at all, depends not on the laborers, but on the men of ability who direct them; and the spread of Socialism among the classes who have thus far adopted it as a creed, a desire, a demand, as a thing to work for, does no more to prove that Socialism is really practicable, than a change in the taste and temper of frame-makers and weavers of canvas would do to inaugurate a new school of painting.

The above observations refer more immediately to the European Continent, and in especial to England. But, so far as I am able to judge, they apply with equal force to America. The dreamers who project themselves into the future, and delight and excite their readers by accounts of what they see on "Looking Backward," are men of precisely the same type as their counterparts in the Old World—men constitutionally incapable of performing any one of those industrial services through which alone their millennial dreams could be realized. If they like to consider themselves nobler characters than the men who add to the world's wealth, motived by the desire to become wealthy themselves, these persons (such prophets as Mr. Bellamy, for instance) are perfectly welcome to their own self-respect; and men of another type will submit to their contempt with equanimity. In that case we may apply to the two classes the following lines of Robert Browning:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The mean man with the little thing to do
Sees it, and does it.
The great man with the great end to pursue
Dies ere he knows it.

The practical masters of commerce and industry may, from some points of view, be as mean as we like to think them; but the material progress of the world and the maintenance of its existing wealth have been due in the past, and are still due in the present, to these men, and not to any others—to the men who, with all their faculties concentrated on immediate ends, and with definite objects of personal ambition before them, see what they want to do, and do it.

If this view of the matter is incorrect,—if collective production requires no rare qualities, if the average laborer is as capable of directing labor as of laboring, or if the faculties required for directing labor do not require the hope of exceptional reward to stimulate them —if, in a word, the scheme of Socialism is practicable, the Socialists can prove its practicability at the present moment, without waiting for any political reconstruction of society, without waiting for any legislative interference with property. I pointed out not long ago to a political gathering in London, that the working classes in the United Kingdom have an immediate available capital of at least a hundred and fifty million pounds sterling. If Socialism has made, as the Socialists now declare, an important advance among certain sections of the middle classes, there will be an immense additional sum by which this hundred and fifty millions may be increased. Let the laborers and the middle-class theorists, who believe that labor is the main source of our existing wealth and that such direction as it requires can be had for the asking, take this capital into their own hands, and show the world that the private capitalist is a superfluity. Let the same thing be done in America. Let Mr. Bellamy, instead of writing romance about the future triumphs of collective labor, become the manager of some socialistic manufacturing company, in which the shareholders will all be laborers and all the laborers shareholders. Let him enrich this multitude with some new scientific discovery; let him invent some new article of utility for the poorer classes; let him do any one of the things done by the capitalistic organizer of labor; and let all the gain be shared equally between himself and the workers, wholly irrespective of the amount of capital they have contributed, or the value of the faculties they have exercised. Or if Mr. Bellamy himself cannot do this, let him invite

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some strike-leader to leave off leading strikers, and instead of exciting employees against some present employer, become himself the director of a certain chosen number of them, and set them to productive work without any employer at all. Only a few object-lessons of this kind would be necessary to place Socialism on a really practical basis, and to show that the main obstacle to its success is at all events not insuperable. If in America this socialistic creed has made, as is asserted, any large number of converts, there must be ample capital available for an experiment of this kind.

If, however, Socialism as yet is unequal to such practical work, as it has thus far shown itself to be, it can be unequal to it for two reasons only: first, that it does not possess in its own fold at present men capable of directing the productive work of the world; and secondly, that it is forbidden by its own principles to offer the only rewards that will enlist such men in its service.

W. H. Mallock.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BATTLE OF STANDARDS AND THE FALL OF PRICES.

It is evident that the final contest on what shall be the standard or unit of value of this country is upon us; the pending question is whether it shall be the present lawful unit—a dollar made of gold—which is worth as much after it is melted as it purports to be worth in the coin—or whether it shall be of silver or paper forced into circulation by the fiat of an act of legal tender. The final issue is joined. The contest may be bitter, and in its course even another purely artificial panic accompanied by a paralysis of trade and industry may be brought upon us, corresponding to that of 1893. Any attack upon the credit of the United States tending to the debasement of the unit of value is dangerous. On the one part this attack has been made by the advocates of the free coinage of silver by this country at the ratio of sixteen to one, without regard to the action of any other country. That effort has been resisted as one of malignant fraud upon the community whatever may be the motives of its promoters, but that danger has been averted.

A more plausible interference with the free choice of a standard or unit of value is made without malignant purpose by the advocates of what is called "bimetallism." Many of these advocates are gentlemen of high repute, of great sincerity of purpose, and of position which entitles their arguments to candid and just consideration.

The true point of this latter effort is obscured by the misuse of the word "bimetallism." Bimetallism exists in all commercial countries. Gold and silver are and will continue to be used for the manufacture of coins which serve as money. The real purpose of the advocates of what is called an international bimetallic treaty for the coinage of these metals at a fixed ratio is to bring the force or fiat of legal tender provisions into international commerce.

In international commerce, which is free of the fiat of legal tender acts, good money by weight of gold has driven all other kinds out of use. The so-called Gresham law works only by force of legal tender in driving good money out of circulation. From the dawn of monetary history, legal tender acts have been conceived only for the pur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pose of making forced loans or for compelling the circulation of depreciated paper or debased coin. Acts or decrees of the latter kind have been the basest frauds ever perpetrated by despotic rulers.

There is but one kind of money which is of universal and world-wide purchasing power. It is the only kind that meets the definition of true money as given by Henry Cernuschi, the ablest and most conspicuous advocate of what is called bimetallism,—gold coin the only coin which is worth as much after it is melted as it purports to be worth in the coin. Gold coin is the only kind of money which does not rest upon the force of an act of legal tender for its circulation. Gold bars of certified weight and quality are even preferred in international commerce to the coined money of any nation.

The advocates of "bimetallism," so-called, rest their case on an alleged "fatal fall in prices" since 1873 and justify their effort upon the ground that the tendency to lower prices must be stopped. In the arguments which have been presented in support of such a treaty of alternate legal tender under the misnomer of "bimetallism," the work of the engineer, the inventor, and the discoverer of new processes in all the arts has been almost wholly ignored.

It is the purpose of this article to prove that there is not a single important product of industry in agriculture, manufacturing, transportation, or commerce in which there has not been a reduction in the cost of production or distribution which will not more than account for any reduction in the price which has occurred between 1873 and 1892. It is admitted that during the panic of 1893, which was caused wholly by the attack upon the unit of value by the advocates of the free coinage of silver and by the fear of their possible success, prices were forced down below cost by the paralysis of trade and industry which ensued. During this panic great numbers of persons were reduced to compulsory idleness; the capital of the country was impaired and the progress of the nation was so retarded as to prevent the great benefits of science and invention, which will presently be dealt with, being more uniformly distributed. In this evil time, while the rich grew no richer, many of the poor were reduced to extreme poverty and even to pauperism. When the future record of this evil period is written the names of those who impaired the credit of the nation will live only to be held up as examples of perverted intelligence or of merely selfish greed and public dishonesty.

In the subsequent table attention will first be called to the evil influence of a debased currency during the long period of war and of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

financial reconstruction from 1861 to 1878. On the first of January, 1879, specie payment was resumed on the only lawful unit of value —a dollar made of gold. Then began the reduction of prices under the beneficial influences of science and invention accompanied by a steady and continuous rise in wages, varying in just proportion to the skill and aptitude of the workman and the steady increase of wealth; all earnings augmenting from common labor upward. This progress has been made in spite of an ill-adjusted system of banking and currency, and in spite of methods of collecting the national revenue which were in some degree obstructive to the progress of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce alike. Yet even these adverse conditions, due wholly to legislation, have been of such minor influence as not to have seriously retarded progress in either department of industry until the panic ensued from the silver craze.

In 1872, under the influence of the fear of the ability of this country to command the gold of the world if it needed it, the payment or funding of the demand notes known as greenbacks was stopped. A volume of notes rated at $346,000,000, which had been issued and made legal tender for the purpose of collecting a forced loan for the conduct of the war, was left in forced circulation. The Supreme Court, most unfortunately, sustained the power of Congress to continue to collect a new forced loan by their re-issue in time of peace, in an opinion which lawyers of highest repute held to be unfounded in the very precedents cited in support of the decision. Then followed a second forced loan under the Bland and Sherman Acts of nearly $500,000,000, by which the people are or will be taxed for the purchase of silver which is now worth only about half what it cost. These notes are also directly or indirectly in forced circulation. But in spite of these abuses of the power of taxation the progress of the nation continued down to the inevitable and long-predicted date when the distrust of this whole system of bad monetary legislation brought on the panic of 1893. This panic was the first process in the cure of the evil itself.

The subsequent table shows how the depreciated currency of the war impaired the purchasing power of labor, notably in the year 1865, in which year the purchasing power of wages had lost more than one-third from 1860. It shows next how long and slow the struggle was to attain the safe standard of the gold unit of value in 1879, and since then how continuous has been the beneficial influence of low prices, small profits, lessening rates of interest and constantly increasing earn-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ings or wages. These favorable conditions, continued from January 1, 1879, until the financial panic in April, 1893, put a temporary stop to progress, causing abject want to exist in the midst of constantly increasing abundance.

In the compilation of this table the prices and wages are derived from the Report thereon of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate computed under the direction of Commissioner Carroll D. Wright. These prices, as well as the prices in London which are given in terms of gold—compiled by Mr. Augustus Sauerbeck—have been computed and compared on the unit of 100 in 1860 by Prof. Roland P. Falconer, of Johns Hopkins University.

PRICES, WAGES, PURCHASING POWER.

	1845.	1850.	1855.	1860.	1865.	1870.	1875.	1880.	1885.	1890.
Meat	79.4	86.6	104.7	100	197.	174.3	140.4	103.6	107.6	99.6
Other food	82.8	80.7	114.5	100	240.3	146.3	135	116.9	97.2	103.5
Cloths and clothing	97.1	91.3	94.7	100	299.2	139.4	120.1	104.5	84.8	82.4
Fuel and lighting	....	102.6	121.1	100	237.8	196.5	156.5	100.2	89.6	92.5
Metals and implements	110.8	114.8	117.8	100	191.4	127.8	117.5	96.3	77.4	73.2
Lumber and building materials	106.7	102.2	103.4	100	182.1	148.3	143.7	130.9	126.6	123.7
Drugs and chemicals	121	123.6	129.2	100	271.6	149.6	144.2	113.1	86.9	87.9
House furnishing	102.3	125.6	121.1	100	181.1	121.6	95	85.2	70.1	69.5
Miscellaneous	114.8	107.7	115.2	100	202.8	148.7	122.9	109.8	97.5	89.7
Average of all prices	102.8	102.3	113.1	100	216.8	142.3	127.6	106.9	93	92.3
Average of all wages	86.8	92.7	98	100	143.1	162.2	158.4	141.5	150.7	158.9
Average wages by importance	85.7	90.9	97.5	100	148.6	167.1	158	143	155.9	68.2
Salaries of city teachers	74.8	83.8	91.4	100	134.7	186.3	188.1	182.8	186.3	86.3
Paper money	100	100	100	100	49.5	81.1	88.8	100	100	100
Gold price of silver bullion in London	95.3	97.3	100	100	99	98.2	92.3	84.7	78.7	77.4
Purchasing power of wages	84.4	90.6	86.6	100	66	114.1	124.1	132.3	162	172.1

The evil influence of a debasement of the currency by an act of legal tender, the purpose of which was to collect a forced loan for the conduct of the war, is brought into conspicuous notice by the figures under the date 1865.

In the consideration of this table regard must be given to the difficulty in obtaining exact data of prices in the earlier periods covered by it. In the general summary of all prices from 1860 to 1891, 223 articles are dealt with. In 1840 only 85 could be determined with sufficient certainty, and there are some doubts about single articles, notably fuel and light, in these earlier years. The returns of wages are taken from books of account and pay-rolls of large establishments throughout.

Evidence is given, by the figures for the years from 1870 to 1890, of the potent causes of this beneficial reduction in the prices of the necessaries of life which has been accompanied by a rise in the earnings of those who perform the manual and mechanical work of production and distribution. The gain of the workmen has proceeded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with accelerating speed ever since January 1, 1879, until April, 1893, when a temporary reversal took place which has already been partially regained. At this date (March, 1895), about half the loss by reduction in wages has been recovered by workmen, and even though doubt and depression still exist, skilled workmen and operatives are fully employed and in many arts more are needed. It has become evident now that the late incapable Congress has dissolved, that the normal conditions of industry might be resumed except for the doubt of what the next Congress may do.

Dealing with these subjects somewhat in the order of their importance, we may first regard the changes in this country and in England. The English prices are taken from Sauerbeck's tables for articles substantially corresponding to the American.

I. MEATS.—Prices in the United States in 1860 in gold are taken at 100; in 1870 in paper they were 174.3; in 1890 in gold, 99.6. Animal food in England, Sauerbeck's tables, in gold, 1860, at 100; in 1870, 108; in 1890, 91.1.

Since 1860 the causes for a reduction in price of animal food are the extension of railways, the establishment of great packing-houses, the inventions in canning provisions, the application of freezing processes and cold-storage chambers, and the change from sail to steam on the ocean. In production, the rediscovery and use of ensilage and many other improvements in feeding stock of all kinds. In 1860 the supply of meat to great cities was limited to farms and pastures in close proximity; in 1870 the movement of live or dressed animals by rail was insignificant and by steamships of no influence or effect. In 1860 and in 1870 the beeves of South America and Texas were slaughtered mainly or only for their hides; they possessed no international food value. The great prairies of the United States were still buffalo ranges, and the sheep of Australia and New Zealand yielded use and value only in wool and tallow. In 1890 every part of the animal had become an article of international commerce, while the cheese factory and the creamery had made an economic revolution in dairy processes. Had not the purchasing power of the great masses of the people increased with the stability of the gold standard and with the rise in wages, a great reduction in the prices of animal food must have ensued. Had not the supply of gold fully compensated for the partial disuse of silver as a full legal tender, a greater reduction might have occurred.

II. FOOD OTHER THAN MEAT.—Grain, roots, fruits and vegetables, sugar (chiefly grain). Prices in the United States in 1860 in gold are taken at 100; in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1870, they were 146.3 in paper; in 1890, in gold, 103.5. Food in England, Sauerbeck's tables, in gold, 1860, 100; in 1870, 88.8; in 1890, 66.6.

The influences tending to great reductions in prices since 1870 have chiefly affected grain and sugar. Since 1870 the sources from which the greater part of the wheat exported from the United States is produced have been opened by railways and waterways. Machinery has been invented greatly reducing the labor cost of production. Almost revolutionary improvements in milling have been made. The result of all these factors has been to reduce the cost of placing wheat on sale in London or Liverpool from Minnesota or Dakota by an amount equal to one-half the price at the average of 1870. In sugar the change in methods of production and refining have been equally great, and heavy duties have been removed in Great Britain and for a time in this country. In other vegetable products corresponding changes have occurred, but root and vegetable crops must be provided nearer to the points of consumption than grain and sugar. In general it may be affirmed that increased power of consumption has kept the prices of food other than meat, except wheat, above the level that improvements might have warranted. The greater average reduction in 1890 as compared to 1860 in Great Britain is explained by the much greater dependence of the people on wheat, in the production and distribution of which the greatest changes have occurred.

III. CLOTHS AND CLOTHING in the United States. Textile materials, chiefly cotton and wool, in Great Britain. Prices in United States in 1860, in gold, 100; in 1870, in paper they were 139.4; in 1890, in gold, 81.1. Textile materials not converted in England, Sauerbeck's tables, in gold, 1860, 100; in 1870, 124; in 1890, 76.5.

The Civil War in the United States increased the price of cotton to $1.90 per pound at the highest point in paper, and also produced almost a cotton famine in England. The war demand for woollen fabrics carried the prices of wool to an extravagant point. Then followed the vast increase of crops of cotton by free labor; tools and instruments with which slaves could not be entrusted but which freemen use were generally introduced; the secondary products of the cotton seed presently reached a value of $30,000,000 a year, all previously wasted. Australia went from an insignificant position to a product of wool which exceeds that of any other country. Immense improvements were made in the mechanism of the factory; the use of the sewing-machine became almost universal in the United States and very general in Great Britain. In every branch of these arts the labor cost was lessened while the earnings of labor were aug-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mented. Egypt under English control developed an increasing supply of cotton, while India resumed its former unimportant position which is due to the inferiority of its cotton staple. No other causes need be or can be assigned for the very moderate average reduction of prices indicated by Sauerbeck's figures, which are at the gold standard. This reduction is not commensurate with the vast improvements in production.

IV. METALS AND IMPLEMENTS. AVERAGE MINERALS. Metals and implements in the United States, prices in 1860, in gold, 100; in 1870, in paper, they were 127.8; in 1890, in gold, 74.9. Average minerals in England, Sauerbeck's tables, in gold, in 1860, 100; in 1870, they were 94.2; in 1890, 87.4. There is no standard by which the progress of nations can be more surely gauged than by the increasing use of iron, steel, and copper. The recorded production of iron in the world in 1860 was less than 7,000,000 tons; in the United States a little over 900,000 tons. In 1870, world, 11,200,000 tons; United States, 1,865,000 tons. In 1892, world (estimated about), 26,000,000 tons; United States, 9,157,000 tons. The production of Bessemer steel in the United States: in 1860, none; in 1892, 4,168,000 tons.

The dominion of iron and steel has passed to the United States. The inventions of Bessemer, Holley, Siemens, Reese, Thomas, Gilchrist, and a host of others disclose astounding reductions in the labor cost, while the opening of the iron mines of the United States in the Northwest and South and of the great coking coal mines of Virginia and other States, give reason for and explanation of reductions in prices more than commensurate with what have occurred. Inventions of a similar kind and the opening of new sources of supply of copper and silver need only to be referred to in order to comprehend the lessened prices of these metals, while aluminum has been added and the invention of many new alloys have enlarged the field of use. Hard times are the sternest schoolmaster and have brought prices in 1894 to the lowest point, yet the product is now increasing and promises soon to reach the highest point ever known.

V. LUMBER AND BUILDING MATERIALS. In the United States, prices in 1860, in gold, 100; in 1870, in paper they were 148.3; in 1890, in gold, 122.3.

These articles are not included in Sauerbeck's tables. Heavy duties on Canadian products and the rapid depletion of forests in the North and East in the United States have been partially counterbalanced by the opening of the sources of hard wood in the mountain section of the middle South and of hard and yellow pine in the lower Southern States. The lessening of railway charges has rendered the vast supplies of Puget Sound available in the far East. New inventions applied to felling and sawing timber have reduced the cost and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saved the waste. Mechanism has displaced hard labor to a great extent in making brick and preparing stone, but much yet remains to be accomplished in these lines. Wages have risen to the highest relative point in the building trades, and in making carriages, wagons, and railway cars, and in other arts in which wood is used as a component material of proportionately high importance. A revolution has occurred in the manufacture of furniture, which has ceased to be a handicraft in all parts except those which are of æsthetic value calling for the highest skill of the handicraftsman. Any reference to the change in the ratio of silver to gold in this branch of industry would be an economic absurdity. The prices of many kinds of timber are now higher in gold than they were in paper money in 1870. Had timber and its manufactures been included in Sauerbeck's tables, the average reduction so often quoted would have been considerably lessened.

VI. Drugs and Chemicals. House Furnishing.

The subjects dealt with under these headings and in the subsequent tables call only for general treatment. In the manufacture of dye-stuffs the development of the whole series of the products of petroleum has totally changed all the conditions of the arts of dyeing and printing, reduced the cost and increased the supply. Revolutionary changes in the manufacture of alkalies have reduced the cost, increased the supply, and have removed some of the most noxious conditions of the work. The end is not yet: the application of electricity developed by water-power to the dissociation of salt or sea water may again reduce the cost and increase the production of alkalies. In the production of fertilizers the wide distribution of Stassfurt potash has given a supply of that necessary element at a very much reduced cost. The working of the phosphate deposits of South Carolina and the discovery and development of the huge deposits in Florida have given assurance of an unlimited supply of phosphoric acid to the cotton and grain fields of this Continent for centuries to come, and have also added an important commodity to our exports. The development of the products of cotton seed has added an oil of the greatest value and increasing abundance—useful both as a food product and as an element in manufactures. The saving of the waste products of formerly almost useless phosphoric iron ores, which are converted in the basic process of making steel, and their conversion to use as a fertilizer, ends in the increased production of bread from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

iron stone. Processes have been perfected in Europe and are now being developed in the United States for the conversion of the previously wasted gases of the coke ovens into sulphate of ammonia. But the most important discovery of the present decade, giving assurance of an abundant food-supply to any population that can occupy the land for ages to come, is the conversion of the nitrogen to the renovation of the soil through the bacteria that, living and dying in the nodules attached to leguminous plants, dissociate it from the air. This source of nitrogen in combination with the potash and phosphates already named gives assurance of the nutrition of the soil, the plant, the beast, and the man in such abundance that no one can yet measure the limit of production of an acre of land anywhere.

WAGES. SIMPLE AVERAGE.

There is no work in economic history equal in its scope, accuracy, and importance to the report on prices and wages compiled by Commissioner Wright and his assistants. Books of account and pay-rolls reaching back over fifty years were placed at the disposal of the Commissioner and his assistants. The average wages of great railway systems, of factories and of workshops were not only disclosed, but the separate wages with the sex of the operatives in each department of the work are given from dates as early as 1840. Opening Vol. 3 we find, for instance, the first table, No. XII., relating to the manufacture of cotton goods. Wages from 1842 to 1890 are given year by year under forty-five different divisions of the work, beginning with fourteen hours a day and ending with ten hours. From my own investigation and knowledge of this branch of industry with which I have been connected as boy and man from 1842 to 1894, I can prove that the productive capacity of the average operative in a given mill working year by year throughout the period named has increased from 4,321 yards a year in 1830 to 9,607 yards in 1840 and is now over 30,000 yards.

Since 1840 wages have doubled, hours having been reduced from fourteen to ten per day, and are now earned under better and more wholesome conditions of work, while prices have been very greatly reduced.

WAGES ACCORDING TO THE IMPORTANCE OF THE WORK. These have been separately computed by Professor Falconer.

The progress of science and the application of invention tend to cause a great variation in the earnings of those who do the work.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The common laborer who digs and delves is supplied with better tools, but the measure of his earnings is limited to the amount of merely physical energy which he can apply. His wages have not risen as much as those of skilled workmen. The application of more and more automatic mechanism in the factory by division of labor, however, enables men and women of lesser intelligence to perform many kinds of work which formerly demanded a high degree of personal skill rather than of mere aptitude. The earnings of those thus moved from field to factory have been augmented more than those of common laborers. It is in the arts that call for both manual skill and mental capacity that the greatest progress has been made. The craftsman of modern times is he who knows how to direct the mechanism which gives the maximum of product with the minimum of exertion and the least loss of time. Hence it follows that the wages of those who perform the most difficult work, selected according to its importance, show the greatest advance, indicating that each man makes his own rate of wages as he develops his ability, provided he keeps the sole control of his own time and the free choice of his work.

There are no tables of figures which give a surer indication of the progress of the people of this country in spite of all the crudities of financial legislation and the obstruction of our revenue system, than the statistics of postal service and the increased number and efficiency of the teachers in our schools. While other nations prepare for war we prepare for work, wasting but little of our substance on battle-ships bearing the disgraceful name of "commerce destroyers," which if used at all could only destroy the commerce of our best customers. The postal receipts of the United States have advanced from fourteen and a half millions ($14,556,159) in 1865 to nearly seventy-one millions ($70,930,475) in 1892.

The appropriations for schools and colleges increased from $60,000,000 in 1871 to $155,000,000 in 1892. The new generation which is taking the place of the one which was depraved by the speculative era of depreciated paper money and by the perversion of taxes imposed for the support of war to the private gain of individuals in time of peace, is rapidly learning the lessons of sound money,—of economy in the conduct of government,—of the necessity of purging the civil service,—and of assuring the receipt by the Government of all the taxes that the people pay.

Changes in the average earnings of employees in 1890 as compared with 1860 by percentage, 1860 taken at 100 in each case:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. Books and newspapers	148.6	8. Railway service	148.4
2. Building trades	172.5	9. Stone workers	165.2
3. Carriages and wagons	202.4	10. Woollen fabrics	167.8
4. Cotton fabrics	165.1	11. All industries	160.7
5. Illuminating gas	167.7	12. Salaries city teachers	186.3
6. Lumber	177.9	13. Prices of all goods	92.3
7. Metals and metal goods	148.6	14. Purchasing power all wages,	172.1

In this table comparison has been given by which the relative progress of the different classes of those who are occupied in various pursuits are compared. In the consideration of it regard must be given to the fact that many women and children are occupied in the four branches of industry numbered 1 to 4, while in numbers 5 to 10 those who do the work are mostly adult men. Compilations cannot be made with the same completeness in respect to those who are occupied in agriculture, in trade and commerce, or in personal service, but the same rule and tendency can be traced. All arts and occupations are governed by the same law of competition under which, as capital increases, it also becomes more and more effective, so that while securing decade by decade an increasing aggregate profit, the ratio of profit to the product is diminished; conversely, those who perform the manual and mechanical work secure to their own use and enjoyment an increasing proportion of a constantly increasing product, while their labor is diminished both in hours and in the intensity of the effort.

The subsequent table will bring before the eye of the reader the fluctuations in the English gold prices of forty-three articles of necessity which are in common use, comprising vegetable and animal food: tea, coffee and sugar; minerals; textile materials and sundries. This table was compiled by Professor Falconer from Sauerbeck's table of the gold prices in London, the unit or index number being taken at 100 in 1860. The so-called bimetallic system was in use and practice in Germany and the Latin Union from 1846 to 1872 inclusive. The gold standard of legal tender was in use and practice from 1873 to 1892. Prices were gravely influenced during the first period by the English war with China, by the Sepoy revolt in India, by the Crimean, Austro-Prussian and Franco-Prussian wars in Europe, and by the Civil War in the United States, all occurring between 1846 and 1872. Since 1872 there has been peace in the United States and a state of passive war or preparation for war in Europe miscalled peace, which may only culminate in active war by which all the financial and industrial conditions of the world will be profoundly changed.

Variations year by year in the average prices of forty-three arti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cles of necessary use, consisting of animal and vegetable food, tea, coffee and sugar, minerals including coal, textile materials and sundries, computed at London prices in gold by Mr. Augustus Sauerbeck and compared with the average of 1860 by Professor Roland P. Falconer, of Johns Hopkins University:

1846 TO 1873 INCLUSIVE.

1846	92.2	1856	102.8	1866	106.5
1847	97.9	1857	106.9	1867	103.9
1848	79.9	1858	93.3	1868	103.1
1849	76.4	1859	95.2	1869	101.9
1850	79	1860	100	1870	100.3
1851	77.1	1861	99.6	1871	102.6
1852	80.8	1862	105.6	1872	112.5
1853	96.9	1863	109.3	1873	116.6
1854	106.2	1864	112.3		
1855	103.1	1865	105.8		

1873 TO 1891 INCLUSIVE.

1873	116.6	1880	91.8	1887	70.7
1874	107	1881	88.5	1888	73.9
1875	100.3	1882	88	1889	76.7
1876	97.5	1883	86	1890	76
1877	97.4	1884	79.3	1891	75.4
1878	91.2	1885	75.4		
1879	86.7	1886	72.4		

Later returns are not yet tabulated, but show small further reduction until the panic created world-wide disturbance in commerce.

Sauerbeck's tables are quoted more than any others by the advocates of the bimetallic treaty of legal tender, under which it is proposed to give the creditors of the United States an option to pay us for our grain, provisions, copper, iron, steel, oil, and manufactures in silver, while depriving ourselves of the choice or power of demanding gold. This policy is sustained on the authority of Sauerbeck's tables and upon the ground that there has been a "fatal fall" in prices since 1873 which is attributed to the disuse of silver as money of full legal tender,—to which partial disuse of silver as money the term of "demonetization" has been misapplied. Upon an examination of Sauerbeck's table it will appear that there was a fall in prices in 1849 to a point as low within a fraction as the average of 1890 and '91; then a rise; next a fall and then a rise in 1864 to a point nearly as high as in 1873; then a fall, and then the final great speculative rise and financial debauch in 1873, when English credit and goods began to be spread over the world in a way which has but lately culminated in the disastrous losses in Australia and in South America. It will be observed that there were greater fluctuations and variations in the course of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prices and almost as great a fall at one period between 1846 and 1872, when the Latin Union was in existence and silver was coined in France freely at the ratio of fifteen and a half of silver to one of gold, as there have been since silver was deprived of its full function of legal tender.

I will not treat of Sauerbeck's tables in detail. Suffice it that when each separate type of the forty-three articles is dealt with year by year, it is found that a few have risen since 1873, others have fallen but little, others greatly, others have varied from year to year, but there is no sign of any influence causing a steady tendency to depression such as is asserted by the so-called bimetallists.

Since 1873, there have been less fluctuations than before, rather an orderly reduction in most prices, varying slightly with the difference in seasons in each year, but corresponding closely with reduction in cost. This beneficial fall has been accompanied by a corresponding or correlative rise in wages,—greater in the United States than in any European States. Since 1873, under the influence of peace and the stability of the gold unit of value, this beneficent fall in prices has also been accompanied by a vast development of international commerce.

In this object-lesson I have endeavored to bring into conspicuous notice the evils which have always ensued from the degradation of the standard of value of every nation when by acts of legal tender the confidence of the people in the stability of its unit or standard of value has been impaired. This evil has been effected over and over again in this country by forcing into use, under acts of legal tender, either its own promises or silver coin which does not contain in its own substance the elements of its own valuation and which is not worth as much in bullion as it purports to be worth as coin.

The dangerous periods in the life of this nation have been due to the mismanagement of its finances and not to war. The patriot cause was brought nearer to disaster by the financial incompetence of the patriot Congress than by all the arms and arts of the enemy combined. The disruption of the nation was more nearly brought about by high tariffs between the States during the confederation before the adoption of the Constitution than it was in the civil war by which slavery destroyed itself. There was never any danger that slavery would triumph over freedom in the civil war by force of arms; the real hazard was in the dangerous discredit of the country and in the narrow escape from bankruptcy due to the forced circulation of de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preciated paper money. The victory of President Grant in the veto of the greenback inflation bill of 1874 stands equal in its financial importance to the victory at Vicksburg by which the back of the Southern confederacy was broken during the war. The same credit may be given to President Hayes who vetoed the Bland Act, but an incapable Congress passed it over his veto and brought the malignant power of the Government into action for the collection of a forced loan for the purchase of the silver which now encumbers the vaults of the Treasury. In that blunder we find the first cause of the recent panic.

The fear of free coinage of silver caused a distrustful Congress to pass the Sherman Act for greater and more useless purchases of silver and for an increase of the forced loan, and of the debt of the Government due on demand, carried by this act to nearly $500,000,000, which culminated in the panic of 1893 and the paralysis of industry which ensued. That debt incurred for silver purchases has yet to be paid by taxation. The maintenance of the integrity of the nation and the stability of its credit has lately rested once more upon the courage of President Cleveland when betrayed by the party of which he was the chosen leader. This party has since been almost wiped out of existence as the penalty for its lack of conviction and cohesion. At each period of financial danger the responsibility has been met and the danger has been averted at the cost of widespread disaster and distress. During the civil war even the withdrawal of a seventh part of the men of arms-bearing age and the destructive demand growing out of the consumption of war, did not advance wages as fast as prices rose; the purchasing power of a day's work lost by one-third in that dark financial period.

When once more the evil influence of a discredited currency, which was issued in a time of profound peace at the dictation of the mining camps, whose power in the Senate is in inverse proportion to their population, brought on the panic of 1893, a paralysis of industry ensued and great masses of people suffered for the want of the means of subsistence in the midst of an unparalleled abundance of food, fuel, fibres, and fabrics of every kind.

But even in the time of doubt during and immediately after the Revolution,—even in the time of distress during the war of 1812 and the embargo,—even in the throes of the civil war and the difficulties of reconstruction,—even during the later era of financial folly and incapacity exhibited by the legislators of both political parties

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

since 1878,—the common people have adjusted themselves to every adverse condition that it was in the power of misdirected financial legislation to bring into existence, and such have been the potent influences of science and invention which have been applied to production and distribution since 1865, that never before in the history of this or any other country has there been such material progress in all the arts by which we live and move and have our being.

The existing discontent, the struggle between laborers and capitalists, the violent strikes and disorders which have marked the last few years are all due to the bad financial policy which promotes a false distribution of the joint product of labor and capital. Within less than a single decade each political party has been utterly condemned for its abuse of the trust that had been reposed in it. Western Republicans are now repudiating the abuses of the power of taxation which was forced upon them in 1890, while eastern Democrats are organizing for independent action upon the monetary question without regard to the financial folly of Ohio or the yet greater iniquity contemplated by a portion of their party in the extreme West and in a small section of the South.

The issue is joined to which there can be but one conclusion: the unit of value, a dollar made of gold, will be maintained and the integrity of the nation will be sustained.

The incapable Congress which has just passed ignobly into history has almost unwittingly left the resumption act unrepealed under which it is the duty of the Executive to pay the demand notes of the Government when presented and to maintain the parity of the silver notes to gold. The revenues are now equal to the expenditures or more. Those who hold United States notes may present them for redemption in gold coin which may be secured to any necessary extent from the sale of interest-bearing bonds. Since there are no appropriations on which these redeemed notes can be reissued, the current revenue being ample to meet all appropriations, these paid notes must rest in the Treasury in a state of innocuous desuetude until they are cancelled by an act of some future Congress.

The advocates of what is called bimetallism who promote the negotiation of an international treaty of legal tender have been repeatedly challenged—1st. To name the rates of weight of silver to gold at which they propose to force the equivalent acceptance. 2d. To name a single article of any considerable importance on which the admitted decline in price cannot be accounted for by the application

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of science and invention to production and distribution. 3d. To show how the legal parity of the two metals at the treaty ratio is to be maintained if producers, merchants, exporters, importers, and bankers individually choose to deal with each other on the unit of a given weight of gold whether coined or not. 4th. They are asked to state on what ground an act of legal tender can be justified which gives a debtor the power to force upon a creditor a kind of money which the creditor does not want, and has not agreed to take, while depriving the creditor of any choice in the matter. 5th. It may also be asked why there should not be an international agreement for the free coinage of an international coin made of gold and an international coin made of silver under new names, each distinct from the other, preferably adjusted by weight to the metric system. Would not such free coinage meet every just demand for bimetallism? 6th. What need has gold coin of any act of legal tender, national or international, to enforce its acceptance when of full weight and true to its name? This challenge is renewed. These questions have never been answered.

This paper is addressed only to those who are convinced that there must be a unit of value. That unit is now established by law—United States Statutes at Large, Section 3511: "The gold coins of the United States shall be a one dollar piece, which at the standard weight of twenty-five and eight-tenths grams shall be the unit of value."

The advocates of an international treaty of legal tender hold that two substances, gold and silver of unequal cost, differing in proportionate supply and varying greatly in their bullion value, can be made equal in their estimation by the *fiat* of law, under which debtors may force the acceptance of one or the other upon their creditors. This conception differs only in degree from the crude vagaries of the advocates of fiat money made of paper. This singular delusion arises from the conception that gold has not become the unit of value without fiat or treaty through natural selection. Yet such is the fact, government being powerless to do more than to establish the weight and quality of gold coin and to name the coins.

From the dawn of history he who removed the bounds of his neighbor's land has been accursed of the gods. In the progress of history he who has debased the coin of the realm has been accursed among men. As time goes on only those who maintain the unit of value of this nation will be held in honor or repute.

EDWARD ATKINSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS SOUND FINANCE POSSIBLE UNDER POPULAR GOVERNMENT?

WHENEVER the times become hard, whenever business is depressed, money difficult to earn, and the country brought face to face with serious financial troubles, a feeling of despondency is sure to set in. Under the baleful influences of such periods of distress as that through which we are now passing, men of sense and judgment lose faith in the success of democratic institutions and the wisdom of majority rule. It is easy enough, they say, for the great mass of our fellow-citizens to form a fairly correct judgment on a question of pure politics. Even if they fail to form a correct judgment, even if they do adopt wrong standards, pursue wrong methods, and put bad men in power, it is still possible for the community to be prosperous and happy though misgoverned. But when the question to be dealt with is so intricate and complex as to be beyond the comprehension of the great mass of men, is it safe to leave it to be decided by majority rule? In the light of our past history the answer is, Yes.

Of all the people of the earth we are the most practical and the least theoretical. Experience, not theory, has ever been our guide. Nowhere else do theories of finance, theories of political economy, of government, of social organization count for so little. Nowhere else does that wisdom gained by daily contact with the affairs of life count for so much. The very Constitution under which we live is a signal illustration of this. It was quite as much a business as a political necessity, and bears all over it the marks of a bitter experience. The dreadful state of trade, foreign and interstate, the disorders of the currency, the lack of a uniform circulating medium, the hopelessness of trying to support a government which could not tax, these were the considerations which outweighed all others and moved our ancestors to frame and adopt the Constitution. Any student of politics could have told them, and many did, that it was idle to expect that thirteen petty Republics could regulate a common foreign trade as successfully as one central government. But not till the experiment had been made and failed were the people ready to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bestow on Congress *sole* power to regulate trade with foreign countries, between the States, and with the Indians. Any student of finance could have told them that thirteen kinds of paper money issued on no security and maintained by tender laws and force acts could never become the circulating medium of a great people. But not until they had tried it, not until they had brought themselves to the brink of ruin by the experiment, were our ancestors willing to declare that no State shall coin money, emit bills of credit, or make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts.

The financial crisis which extorted these concessions from the people of the several States was the worst this country ever went through, and it was fully believed that the like of it would never return. By the words "bills of credit" was meant what we now call paper money, and, under the injunction that neither Congress nor the States should issue them, it seemed certain that the days of fiat money were over in the United States. That the States in time would find an instrument, and authorize it to do what they could not legally do themselves, was not thought possible, for State-banking had but just begun. On the day the Constitution became the supreme law of the land there were but three banks in the entire country. But, fostered and cherished by the amazing prosperity which sprang up under the new Government, they increased and multiplied and spread over the States till, when 1812 came, two hundred and eight State banks were doing business. Each had power to issue notes to the amount of three times its capital, and each exceeded its power. Even in the East the circulating medium was not specie but paper, for without it the needs of trade could not have been met. A mania for banks swept over the country, and the days of paper money, of bills of credit, returned again. The behavior of the people during this time is most instructive, and to those who put not their trust in the people it ought to be most consoling, if not convincing. Affairs on the seaboard were bad enough; but it was in the wild West of those days that the crisis was severest and the remedies applied most radical.

The dull times which followed the opening of our second struggle with Great Britain, and above all the hard times which came after the close of the war, were the immediate causes of an immense immigration from the seaboard to the Mississippi Valley. That the arrival of these new-comers should be attended by speculation in land, in town sites, in everything of which they stood in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

need, was inevitable. But they came just at the time when the West was passing through a commercial revolution. The steamboat had appeared on the Mississippi and the Ohio, and no event of modern times has surpassed that in importance. The West, in the opinion of its people, was no longer dependent for its supply of foreign goods on Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York. New Orleans was to be the great port of entry. To it were to come all the products of the West Indies, all the manufactures of Europe, the cotton fabrics, the woollen cloth, the hardware, the crockery—everything which for a generation past had been carried at great cost over the mountains,—and once at New Orleans they were to be transported by steamboat to St. Louis, to Louisville, to Cincinnati, and even to Pittsburg. The prospect of sudden commercial development, joined to the arrival of hundreds of thousands of new settlers, brought on an era of the wildest speculation, in which the whole community was eager to join. One great obstacle barred the way: money was scarce. The new-comers brought none. The old settlers had but little, and that little consisted of cut money, or Spanish dollars cut into quarters and eighths to serve as small change, some foreign coin, and the paper notes of such banking institutions as the State and territorial legislatures had chartered, or as had sprung up and were issuing money without a legal right to do so.

This currency, which had never at any time been more than sufficient for the needs of the West, was now in the new order of things totally inadequate to the wants of the people. The cry for money, above all for cheap money, for money that could be borrowed in large sums on the wildest security, went up from every part of the Mississippi Valley, and was heard. For several years no legislature ever met but new banks were established and a flood of paper money issued, which the people made haste to borrow, invest, and lose. Ohio chartered twenty; Indiana, three; Illinois, two; Tennessee, twelve; Missouri, two, and actually issued loan certificates and, in defiance of the Federal Constitution, made her paper legal-tender. Kentucky in 1818 chartered forty-six. The history of these Kentucky banks is unquestionably the most striking chapter in the annals of fiat money. The honest purpose and the high hopes with which they were created; the eagerness and universality with which their notes were borrowed and circulated; the load of debt entailed; the fury of the people when the day of reckoning came; the wicked and unjust method of relief, and the final triumph of good sense and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

majority rule—all combine to make it a lesson full of instruction at this moment.

There were then doing business in the State the Bank of Kentucky, with branches wherever occasion really required them, and, since 1817, two branches (or offices of discount and deposit) of the new Bank of the United States. As the branches of the United States Bank issued drafts, but no bills, and as the Bank of Kentucky was compelled to redeem its notes in specie, neither institution could begin to supply even a small part of the circulating medium demanded. It was for the purpose of supplying such a medium, therefore, that the forty-six banks were chartered. Thirty-five of them actually went into operation and were known, in the hour of their popularity, as "the Independent Banks," but in the time of their adversity as "the Litter." The nominal capital of them all was not far from eight millions of dollars. The actual capital was little or nothing, for the very same specie went from bank to bank, remaining in each one just long enough for the letter of the law to be complied with. To have made their notes redeemable in specie would have been such an idle farce that it was not attempted, so Bank of Kentucky notes were substituted. It mattered little what they were redeemable in, for the people were glad to get them, and the branches of the United States Bank willingly took them in payment of drafts on the Eastern cities. As the notes of the Independent Banks were thus exchangeable for United States branch drafts, which in turn were exchangeable for specie or European products in Baltimore, or Philadelphia, or New York, the effect was the same as if Kentucky paper had been made current money at the seaboard. They were greatly in demand, were issued in large quantities, and were passing freely from hand to hand, when suddenly the Bank of the United States at Philadelphia sent forth an imperative order to its western branches to stop all loans, and hurry a great sum of specie eastward. They at once responded, and in a moment the whole West was bankrupt. Bank after bank suspended specie payment, and among them was that of Kentucky. Well it might, for the amount of debts owed by the people of Kentucky to the two branches of the United States Bank was two million seven hundred thousand dollars. Public opinion forced it to resume almost immediately. But the harm was done, and the community, almost as one man, rose against the Bank of the United States. Resolutions were introduced in the legislature asking the president of the bank to withdraw the branches from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State, and when nothing came of this a tax of five thousand dollars a month was laid on each of them. The banks, it may well be supposed, refused to pay, and in February, 1819, before the first instalment was due, application was made in the district court of the United States for an injunction to stop the execution of the law, which did not, it was claimed, impose a tax, but inflicted pains and penalties, as it was on its very face intended to drive the two branches out of the State. The court refused to consider the question of constitutionality of the law, because the famous case of McCulloch against Maryland was still pending in the Supreme Court; but granted a temporary injunction till the meeting of the Circuit Court in May.

This afforded some satisfaction; but no relief. Indeed, as the autumn of 1819 came, matters grew worse. The crops were abundant; flour, hemp, and tobacco were plentiful. But no market existed, and the people, realizing that the means of settling their debts were as remote as ever, resorted in desperation to county meetings and took into consideration their financial situation. The address adopted at one of these gatherings sets forth that the scarcity of money, the pressure of the banks on individuals and of individuals on those indebted to them, the difficulty of raising even moderate sums by enormous sacrifices of property, the usurious rates of interest demanded, and the general embarrassment of the business world, were hastening a general suspension of specie and the utter destruction of social order and happiness. Taken together these causes threatened to bring suddenly into the market, at forced sales at auction, a large part of the most valuable property in the State. The numerous sales, with few bidders, would surely shift this property from the many to the few, entail misery on the husbandman, and leave a heart-broken, dispirited population in a desolate land. Neither justice nor humanity should permit such ruin if a peaceable remedy could be found, and it could be found if the banks would suspend specie payment, stop their calls, issue more bills, and if the legislature would meet and decide how much paper each bank could issue and what sort of security the borrower should give for it.

At some of the meetings the question was flatly put whether the banks should not be encouraged to suspend. Sometimes the decision was in the negative; but generally the will of the majority was that they should. No popular encouragement to stop payment was needed, and the Independent Banks, after seeing their notes steadily depreciate to a discount of twenty, thirty, forty per cent, were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brought to such a pass that seventeen suspended and by so doing lost their charters. The Bank of Kentucky followed, and the whole State was in confusion. Ten millions of dollars were owed the banks by the people, and from this load of debt the legislature now attempted to rid the community by legislation. The law chartering the litter of independent banks was repealed. The Senators and Representatives of the State at Washington were called on to do their best to have the branches of the United States Bank removed from Kentucky; and a stay law passed which suspended all sales under executions, decrees, and replevins for sixty days after the passage of the law if the defendant gave bonds that the goods levied on would be produced at the end of that time. The acting Governor refused to sign it. He did not believe, he said, that a law should delay or deny justice. But the legislature passed the act over his veto, gave permission for the introduction of a bill to declare void all sales made under any execution issued in favor of the Bank of the United States or its branches and, just before the expiration of the sixty-day stay, law passed a replevin act of a most shameful character. Thenceforth, when any execution issued, on any bond, judgment, or decree, from any court or justice of the peace, the plaintiff had the privilege of writing on the bill the words, "Notes of the Bank of Kentucky or its branches will be accepted in discharge of this execution." If he made this indorsement the defendant could replevy but for one year. Should the defendant fail to replevy, the property was to be sold on credit for one year for what it would bring. Should the plaintiff refuse to make the indorsement, the defendant might replevy for two years.

This indorsement and replevin act put off the day of reckoning, and for the time being saved the debtor from the clutches of the law. But the debts of the people, now far more than ten millions of dollars, still remained, and to liquidate them the legislature in 1821 put in operation a new paper-money machine which it called the Bank of the Commonwealth. It was the State treasury turned into a paper-money mill pure and simple. There were no stockholders, no stock, no capital, no redemption of notes. A president and board of directors chosen annually by the legislature managed its affairs. Its funds were, all money paid in for land-warrants, all revenue from the sale of land which the State owned west of the Tennessee River, the stock owned by the State in the Bank of Kentucky, and such unexpended balance as, at the end of the year, might be found in the State treasury.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Its notes were to issue to the amount of three millions of dollars; were to be apportioned among the countries on the basis of taxable property, and were to be loaned on mortgage security to those and to those only who, in the words of the law, needed them "for the purpose of paying his, her, or their just debts," or intended to buy the products of Kentucky for shipment from the State. That the bank might never be under the necessity of suspending, the notes were not redeemable in specie, and that nothing might be wanting to make them as fine specimens of fiat money as ever existed they were made legal tender for all debts due by or to the State.

That the people would take the new money was never doubted, for their debts were heavy and the paper gave them an easy means of liquidation. But that the Bank of Kentucky would refuse the new issue was certain. It was therefore reorganized, its old directors were turned out, and men who favored the Bank of the Commonwealth put in, and the Bank of Kentucky almost immediately suspended.

Meantime the constitutionality of the indorsement and replevin act had been tested in the courts. That it was a flat violation of the Federal Constitution is undoubted. "No State," says that instrument, "shall make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts, nor pass any law impairing the obligations of contracts." It was not long, therefore, before a test case reached the Bourbon circuit court of Kentucky, where the question of constitutionality was raised and decided in the negative. The legislature happening to be in session a member moved for the appointment of a committee to inquire into the decision of the judge who had "grossly transcended his judicial authority and disregarded the constitutional powers of the legislature of this commonwealth." The committee when it reported said that in its opinion the judge had committed a high crime and misdemeanor, and ought to be removed from office. That the judicial department had power to defeat the general policy of the State, deliberately adopted by the legislature, was something the committee could not admit. Such a doctrine was incompatible with the constitutional powers of the legislature, subversive of the best interests of the people, and well calculated to disturb the public peace and shake public confidence in the whole relief system which had been called for by the condition and necessities of the people. An address to the Governor asking him to remove the judge from office was accordingly brought in; but though

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it secured a great majority of the house it failed to pass for want of two-thirds. But the end was not yet. A year later a case involving the question of the constitutionality of the relief laws reached the court of appeals, a body composed of three judges who held office during good behavior. Two agreed that the indorsement and replevin laws were binding on all transactions occurring after their passage, but null and void as to anything which had transpired before that time. The third went farther and declared the laws were unconstitutional and would not be applied by the court in any case.

As the news of this decision swept through the State (though it applied only to contracts made before the passage of the law), excitement and alarm went with it. The legislature was not then in session; but the moment it met, John Adair, the Governor, sent in a most excited message. He accused the court of showing an open disregard for the ancient distinction between right and remedy; with striking at the sovereignty of the State and the right of the people to govern themselves, and committed its decision to the legislature's most solemn consideration. The senate was eager to destroy the court and was prevented only by a tie vote from calling a State convention to amend the constitution and change the judiciary. The house by a large majority declared the decision of the court of appeals to be erroneous; voted that the indorsement and replevin laws were constitutional and valid; and resolved to do something in support of them. But they did nothing; for an election was at hand and the matter went down to the people, to whom an earnest appeal was made to choose men who could vote for an address of removal. The people responded in part and sent back a legislature of which a majority were relief men, and again removal of the judges by the Governor was defeated. Nevertheless a majority could do much, and, following the example set them by Congress in the early months of Jefferson's administration, it repealed the act creating the court of appeals, and legislated all the judges out of office. A new court was then established by another act, and on the bench were placed men who would see to it that the relief laws were sustained and administered in accordance with their plain intent and meaning. But the judges of the old court firmly refused to submit, denied the constitutionality of the repeal of the judiciary act, and continued to hold sittings and to deliver judgments. There were thus two courts in the State, and two parties ranged around them. The "new court party" protested that liberty, republicanism,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democratic institutions, State-rights, self-government were all at stake. The "old court party" admitted that liberty, republicanism, and self-government were indeed at stake. The question, said its leaders, is, Can right and justice be secured under all circumstances in a land where the will of the people rules? Is it possible for an independent judiciary to protect the rights of a minority against the will of an interested, excited, and ill-disposed majority? The answer of the people was, Yes! and when the legislature met in 1825 the house was in the hands of the old court party, and voted to abolish the new court. The senate which held over was in the control of the new court party, and refused to agree. Once more the question went down to the people, and in the elections of 1826 the contest was again between the old court party and the new. This time the triumph was a signal one. The friends of the old court carried both house and senate; the replevin law was repealed, the "new court" was abolished, the old court was reinstated, and justice once more done to debtor and creditor alike.

The history of Ohio during these trying times affords another instance of the final triumph of majority rule after a period during which it seemed impossible to bring the community to a sense of right and justice. In that great State the people had entered with enthusiasm on the manufacture of money, had chartered their banks and were in the full enjoyment of a cheap and plentiful paper currency, when they heard with dismay that the Bank of the United States, that regulator of the currency, was about to open branches at Chillicothe and Cincinnati. In the hope of shutting out what, in the language of its enemies, was called "the hydra-headed foreign shaving shop," the legislature threatened to impose a heavy tax. But the threat was disregarded; the banks came, and in 1819 an annual tax of $50,000 was laid on each of them, and the auditor commanded to issue his warrant on a certain day for the collection of it. Should the banks refuse, the agent was to seize any specie, bank-notes, goods and chattels found in the banking house, and if necessary break open every vault, room, closet, drawer, and box, search them and carry away their contents. The demand for payment of the tax was made in the office at Chillicothe, at the close of a business day in September, 1819. As was expected the money was refused; whereupon the agent, forcing his way into the vaults, broke open the boxes, carried off more than the amount of the tax, and deposited the money in the State treasury at Columbus.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For this act the auditor, his agents, and the State treasurer were sued by the bank, and while the suits were still pending the legislature assembled and began an investigation. The times were now hard indeed. All the fine visions of the speculators, the paper-money men, the bank men had vanished. Bankruptcy and debt were everywhere. Stay laws, replevin laws, indorsement laws, relief laws of every sort were the order of the day. Nothing was so hateful now as a bank, and above all the Bank of the United States. The Supreme Court had decided that a State could not tax it. But Ohio adopted and affirmed the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798 and 1800; hurled a defiance at the Supreme Court, told it that acquiescence was not the necessary consequence of its decisions, and passed "an act to withdraw from the Bank of the United States the protection of the laws of this State in certain cases." If the bank gave notice to the Governor of its willingness to stop the suits against the State officers, and to submit to a four-per-cent tax on its dividends, or leave the State, the Governor might suspend the law by proclamation. If it did not, then every jailer was forbidden to receive into his custody any person committed at the suit of the bank, or for any injury done to it. Every judicial officer was prohibited to take acknowledgment of conveyances when the bank was a party, and every recorder from receiving and entering them. Notaries public were prevented from protesting bills or notes held by the bank and made payable to it; and justices of the peace, judges, and grand juries could no longer take cognizance of any wrong committed on the property of the bank, though it were burglary, robbery, or arson. The bank would not discontinue the suits, nor leave the State, so the law went into effect, and in September, 1820, the Bank of the United States became an outlaw in Ohio.

Here again, as in Kentucky, extreme measures produced their inevitable result. A reaction set in. The good sense of the plain people prevailed over the folly of the legislators, and the law was erased from the statute book. Both in Kentucky and Ohio the cases were extreme; yet they are striking illustrations of the fact that in this country all questions of great importance are finally settled not by Presidents, nor by Congresses, nor by the legislatures of the States, but by the hard common sense of the people, who in their own good time and way have heretofore adjusted all difficulties wisely.

JOHN BACH MCMASTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOCIAL DISCONTENT—III. MORE REMEDIES.

ONE of the worst limitations of free competition is restricted knowledge. Most workmen can do but one thing. When demand for any man's particular thing is interrupted, he is out of employment. This disadvantage has been increased by the division of labor incident to the great industry. It was one of the great bugbears of Marx and his school, and their fear of it was not altogether unreasonable. But while the great industry has been narrowing the workman's function, it has been familiarizing him with new forces, increasing his wages, cheapening his consumption, *and* increasing his leisure. In the first and last points ought to be found the antidotes for the specialization. They ought, especially when early education is rationalized, to lead to that general broadening of capacity that enabled the New England farmer to turn his hand to anything. Manual training, then, and its accompanying instruction in principles, should cover ground enough to enable a man to practise more than one trade, and, if need be, to quickly learn a dozen. With rational teaching, this could be done in less time than, under the apprentice system, it takes to learn one.

Theoretical education and morality blend into each other like adjoining colors in the spectrum. Therefore I shall not attempt farther to discuss the two strictly apart.

Our last Congress, the senatorial dead-lock in the Delaware legislature, the universal municipal corruption, are all illustrations of influences that are sapping the poor man's substance and opportunity. They would probably all be impossible in a country (if such a one existed) where education in citizenship, including economics, had long received decent attention. I should hesitate to make so broad an assertion if I did not believe it to be backed up by something very like a demonstration. I find it in the great contribution made by the young men with the new education to the astonishing political revolution in New York City last November. They gave the City Club, the Good Government Clubs, and the effective organization which brought out the voters and watched the polls; and an unprecedented proportion of them was on the Committee of Seventy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They have done very little work of the kind before. Our previous political reforms have been effected almost entirely by men inspired by long experience. But now the young men are getting the fruits of that experience, in their education. Under the old education, they tended to hold aloof from politics—"above" it, they were ignorant enough to think. But last year, the leading spirits among them, and perhaps even a majority of the active workers, were from the narrow circle of university men. Not only that, but the most astounding detail of the whole astounding aggregate—the defeat of that tyrant of the poor, "Silver-Dollar" Smith, in his previously impregnable stronghold—was the work of the University Settlement Society.[1] The new education seems to have brought the happy fashion that we have all been longing for—the gentleman in politics. If he stays there, he is going to do more for his less fortunate brother than all the Populist parties and Labor parties combined. One strong reason why he did not do it earlier, in the Old World, where he has long existed, is that he did not have the new education. He is beginning to do it, and the new education is probably the principal cause. How then shall we get a serviceable amount of that into the average man?

To begin at the beginning—the beginning of civic education should be made earlier, the principal reason being that if it is not, in most cases it never will be made at all. Civic duties, not to speak of economic ideas, are now inculcated seldom, if at all, before the high-school, and less than 3 per cent of the children ever get as far as the high-school. The reason for postponing this instruction so late is that, earlier, the mind is not supposed to be mature enough for it. Yet I do not remember hearing that objection urged against giving, in the tenderest years, dogmatic instruction in ethics and theology—mysteries beside which those of economics and civics are as plate-glass. There is abundant truth, however, in the objection that at an early age the mind is not prepared to learn economics and civics *from existing text-books*. But I believe in the preparation, for the young, of catechisms of those subjects which, without being entirely dogmatic, would fix in the mind at least the expressions of sound doctrines—expressions that with advancing years would gain significance, and stimulate sound thinking.

[1] As I have been named in these pages as an officer of that society, I should add that I did not have the honor of raising a finger in what was done there "that heroic day."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The preparation of such books would be a task not only useful and patriotic, but not unworthy any degree of genius. But the reader may well ask: Who shall write them, and what shall be put into them? In answer to the first question, and partly to the second, I should beg you to read Professor MacVane's article in the "Quarterly Journal of Economics" for January, on "The Economists and the Public." It probably proves that books to educate the masses should not, as a rule, be written by professed economists, unless by exceptional ones with singular capacity of looking at their own pursuits from the outside; and that they should be written by men more blessed with ingenuity, imagination, and sympathy, than with qualities more directly tending to purely scientific eminence.

As to the sort of treatment that, it seems to me, should be put into the most elementary ones, I have time for but a hasty illustration. Probably, before considering it fit for practical use, I should need to make it over half a dozen times, and I might then conclude that I am not the man to make it at all. But there are men who can. I can attempt an indication, however, and will give it regarding the chief issue of the day.

Question. Suppose there were no money in the world, and a farmer wanted a hat, and his wife a frock, and his child a pair of shoes, can you tell me a good way for him to get them?

Answer. Why, he could trade off a load of potatoes or whatever he might have, at the store.

Q. Do you know the usual name for such dealings?

A. Barter.

Q. When is it customary?

A. Only before people become civilized enough to have money.

Q. Now suppose there were within reach of our farmer, only city stores where they do n't keep all sorts of things at once?

A. Then he would have to cart his potatoes till he could find a village store where they deal in everything he wants, and would barter with him.

Q. But they do n't have good country stores near the cities, because people prefer to deal in the cities. It might be a day's journey to one. Could n't he do something else in the city near by?

A. He might go around till he found a shoemaker who wanted just potatoes enough to pay for a pair of shoes, and a hatter who would take just potatoes enough to pay for a hat, and a dry-goods man who would want just potatoes enough to pay for a frock.

Q. But the city storekeepers would n't bother with such dealings, would they?

A. No, probably not. He might spend a week, perhaps, without finding one who would. They would all laugh at him for asking them to.

Q. Still, of course, all this trouble would be necessary only if we had no money. Now as we have money, what would the farmer naturally do?

A. Take his potatoes where they buy potatoes, and then take his money where they sell shoes or hats or frocks.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Q. So the mere fact that we have money would save him as much trouble as, probably, his potatoes cost. Now think this over in regard to all sorts of dealings, and you will get some idea of the very great usefulness of money. Suppose, though, that our farmer got paid in poor money?

A. Then he could n't do anything: but any man giving another poor money deceives him and robs him.

Q. Very true! And what would you think of a man who tried to make all the money in the country poor.

A. He would be the biggest liar and thief in the country. [I am not sure that I should retain such expressions. But to stamp a strong impression, a heavy blow is needed.]

Q. Perhaps not, and it's not always well to use strong expressions, even if they are true. Perhaps a man might attempt such gigantic fraud as that, from ignorance. I will try to help you to understand. How many kinds of money do you know?

A. Five: bills, gold, silver, nickel, and copper.

Q. Well, now, can you see any great difference between bills and the other kinds?

A. Yes. The bills cannot be used for any other purpose, while the coins can be melted up and used for other purposes.

Q. The bill is worth nothing in itself: why is it valuable, then?

A. Because you can get coin for it. But it would n't be handy to carry around all the coins that a big bill is worth.

Q. True! And, besides, coins are more easily lost than bills. But when you get the coin, can you tell me why a big silver dollar is worth only the same as a little gold dollar?

A. Because it takes a good deal of silver to be worth as much as a little gold. It takes a lot more nickel or copper, though, to be worth as much as silver.

Q. Very good! But do you know whether, as a fact, the silver in a silver dollar is worth as much as the gold in a gold dollar?

And so forth, and so forth: the reader can easily follow the thread for himself, and determine whether or not it is practicable to start the voter, who never goes to high-school, with sound ideas in finance, and so keep him from using his vote, as he has been so generally doing for years, to keep himself out of employment. Of course, after he is started with such elementary ideas, if his education is carried into higher grades, he can be again brought in contact with the same ideas more scientifically classified and stated, and in connections involving wider and wider ranges of principle.

Now that we have learned, what was so long unknown and even denied, that intellectual forces can be used as effectively as physical ones for remedying the frightful inequalities among men, it seems to me, as I think it must to anybody who really considers the subject, that all other objects of study sink, for the time, into relative insignificance. And this for a twofold reason, because sound economics would lift the poor man up, and would prevent him,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in his agonized efforts to lift himself, from blowing us all up—himself first.

And now what, outside the obvious things, shall we try, so far as methods are available, to teach him? First let me premise that if you take him young, he is more teachable than those who only know him full-grown generally suppose. Let me premise, too, that in many of these matters his teachers need teaching almost as much as he does, and what I venture to suggest is by no means meant for him alone.

The fundamental economic idea is, of course, the importance of Private Property *as an institution*. Certainly few people of common-school education ever hear anything more about it than in some form of "Thou shalt not steal." As an institution whose appearance and development are contemporaneous with the appearance and development of civilization itself—an institution, to attack which, by either force or philosophy, is to attack civilization at its root—*the* institution on which rests the main stimulus to energy, prudence, forethought, inventiveness—to all the virtues which produce and conserve—as the institution upon which all this depends, few people have ever heard of Private Property. If all had, and had heard early and persistently, Socialism would be, to any mind of average sanity, nothing but a laughing-stock.

As one of the corollaries of private property, though not of private property alone, and as sharing its functions in the foundation of civilization, next should be taught Contract. Most persons, when they think of Contract, think of either a big piece of paper covered with long words, or of somebody making a great deal of money (generally out of the Government) in some heavy kind of out-of-door work. As an obligation of more importance and more legal weight than a promise or an oath, and which can be incurred by mere spoken words, or, on one side at least, without any words at all, the notion of Contract is to most people unknown; and as probably the one feature most effective in distinguishing the highest communities in the world from mere patriarchal tribes, it is farther out of common apprehension than ether-stress. First of all, of course, should be taught the idea of mutuality—no rights without duties—no rights to another man's service or property without returning what he agrees to accept as equivalent service or property; also no right to withdraw from a contract without the other side's consent. Farther should be given the corollary of mutuality, that what a man wants society to give him

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he should not obstruct society's giving others. If he wants to work he should not, as he too often does in strikes, interfere with society's giving it to others. All this will seem very matter-of-course to most of the people who read it, and yet there are not a few, even of their grade, in whom the sense of contract is very faint, while probably the working-man's faint appreciation of it is responsible for more wasteful strikes, and costs the laborer more sympathy, than all positive agencies put together. But in the upper industrial ranks, too, there is need of more teaching about Contract, and especially about its limitations—that, even in law, it must not involve the doing anything wrong or unwarrantably dangerous, or suicidal; and that in honor, while performance in all normal cases is the height of duty, it is not always the whole of duty; moreover, on the other hand, that insistence on full performance is sometimes the depth of meanness. On the first and last points, the leading case is that of our old friend Shylock. On the second point, anybody can think of cases where a contract unexpectedly leads one man to fortune, and the other to distress. In such cases, for the lucky man to insist that doing "all that the contract calls for" ends his obligation, would be about as mean as Shylock. So too with employers who refuse aid to their employees in disasters, or begrudge them proper working conditions and reasonable sympathy.

Closely connected with the obligation of Contract is the *economic* value of honesty. The teaching of honesty has been too exclusively on "ultra-rational" grounds. The other day I heard a man, eminently successful against peculiar obstacles, asked to what one thing he most attributed his success. After some consideration he uttered, in modest phrase, what really meant that his success had arisen from people trusting him. That, however, was of course as much a result of capacity as of honesty. The value of honesty could be taught not only from this point of view, but from that of the simplicity, and consequent economy, it gives to commercial transactions. In Wall Street, people constantly trust each other's word for millions. In banks, as a matter of fact, signatures are hardly ever scrutinized. A very elementary intelligence can be brought to realize what an enormous waste it would be if all these transactions had to be guarded, in the first case, by elaborate contracts, and in the second by scores of expert examiners: most of the quick exchanges, which cheapen the poor man's staples much more than they do the luxuries of the rich, would simply be impossible. That they are so promi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nent a feature of the modern world, is probably due as much to advance in honesty as in material facilities. In this connection, there is again harm in the snobbery of the press, and also of many people who, whether we admire them or not, we must admit to belong to "society." Both make prominent the possessors of ill-gotten gains, and so not only promote dishonesty, but, through it, the unfortunate economic conditions for which we are seeking remedies. There is only one way in which the inheritor of wealth partly stolen can deserve social position, or attain the really best: that is, by devoting the stolen wealth to the public good. All conspicuous selfish expenditure of the proceeds of thievery promotes the general feeling among the laboring-classes that all wealth is thievery, and keeps alive that rankling, though generally mistaken, sense of injustice which makes labor disputes so bitter, and which, in many honest, if ill-balanced minds, justifies the robbery and murder in so many strikes. The ire of these good people, not to speak of the grief of the judicious, is sufficiently aroused even by the overgrown fortunes honestly possible under the present imperfections of competition; and it must be confessed that the handling of these fortunes has not generally been more apt than that of the stolen ones to allay the social discontent. The fostering of art and letters and efforts at social amelioration are by no means unknown among thei rpossessors, but can hardly be said to be characteristic.

Next to the fundamental ideas of Private Property, Contract, and the Economic Basis of Honesty, the one all-including purpose of education, either to content or to advance the wage-earner, should be to make him appreciate the manager's function, *and* to inspire and fit him to exercise it for himself. As fast as he does that, so fast will he receive the envied share of product that the manager now receives. All the commendable schemes of coöperation and profit-sharing—nay, even all the absurd socialistic schemes, aim at that result, only the latter seek it without fulfilling the prerequisite conditions. They hope by the stupidities of popular suffrage to get *gratis* the results obtainable only from intelligent and arduous management. Moreover it should be taught that as the profits of business management are something that the genius of the manager creates, without him they would not exist at all; and if it is proposed to tax them away from him, for the benefit of those who do not make them, he simply will not take the trouble to create them. I make no excuse for iterating these things over and over: though they are growing to be com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monplace among the few who really study the subject, it may reasonably be doubted whether there is any set of facts in our universe—material, social, intellectual, even moral—that more need impressing upon people in general to-day, than just those: that the great productive forces of the world are intelligence, foresight, initiative, character, not the mere mechanical forces that transfer matter as the greater forces direct.

Next in importance should be taught the fact that the good manager benefits the laborer as well as himself—that the attempt to get along without him would prevent not only the manager's share from coming into being, but also a portion of what the laborer himself is accustomed to receive—in short, that the attempt can only kill the goose.

As statements, all the foregoing about management are coherent enough to be understood by any sane person, whether they are believed or not; they would be vastly more intelligible, even to children, than many, perhaps most, of the statements memorized by them; they are, as just said, of the very first importance; but the number of people, who pass for educated, who never have heard them, is astounding. Yet even some comprehension of the reasons for them is not so difficult. Any bright boy who has watched a gang of laborers can be made to understand why they would not accomplish as much without their foreman, and that probably not one of them could fill the foreman's place. Any bright girl whose home contains servants can be made to realize why the house does not run nearly as well when Mother is long away. At first they think that all that the superintendent does is to keep the laborers up to their work; but they can easily be made to see that that is a minor part of it.

Yet if you succeed in getting these truths into the workman's mind, he would naturally persist: "But the manager's income must add to the cost of commodities: if it were as low as mine, commodities would be cheaper still." No: for then the manager's income would not be produced at all. So goods would cost as much without him—and more, because he does not even get all he produces; moreover he makes goods cheaper than they could be made by a less capable man.

Let us next notice, among the needs of education, two truths even more comprehensive, though more difficult, than any of those heretofore indicated, and whose attainment, with all it requires and involves, it is hardly too much to say, *is* education. One of them is acceptable as yet, in very full significance, only by minds of a high order—in fact,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the degree to which a mind is saturated by it, is perhaps the best test of the elevation of the mind; and yet glimpses of both truths were open to very early thinkers, and can be given at an early age. They may at first seem rather remote from the topic in hand, but nobody apt to read this will find any difficulty in tracing the connection.

The simpler of these truths is the inevitable, even if cruel, necessity of Natural Selection. I do not say its justice. Nature knows nothing of justice. Her machinery pounds remorselessly along in a set of hard conditions, but, after all, pounds out of those conditions the best they will yield. True, she has evolved in us intelligences to slightly direct her course; and it is in using them that the function of justice comes up. But we can direct her only in channels fitted to her own currents: otherwise we are overwhelmed. Now no one of her courses is broader and more clearly marked than that of Natural Selection, and in the exercise of our little liberties and suffrages, we are never so wise as when we fall in with it—when, for example, we raise a Lincoln from his cabin. But so far, we are vastly more apt to prefer the demagogue, and then we suffer. Socialism proposes to extend the danger of this suffering into the field of production. The captains of industry are now chosen purely by natural selection—at least with a very moderate abnormality in the action of heredity, which rapidly cures itself: if the son does not inherit fitness, he soon ceases to survive. But with increasing freedom of competition, and increasing facilities for able men without capital, to hire it, it is substantially true that industry is at present directed by natural selection. For this, the socialist proposes to substitute artificial selection, and that by popular vote. A general knowledge of the superiority of Nature's way would cure this madness.

The other truth so difficult to impart clearly, but not impossible to give some conception of, is the more important. It is difficult not so much because it calls for some preliminary education, as because dogma has been fighting it for thousands of years, and fights it still. To most who read this, every one of these assertions will probably appear strange, when the truth is named in the familiar phraseology—the universal reign of Law. Yet it is the fact that hosts of men who think they believe in it, pray every day that it may not be—that exceptions may be made in their cases. People generally—and legislators generally—in a matter of physiology, would send for a doctor; or in a matter of machinery, for an engineer; or in chemistry, for a chemist; and would follow his opinion with child-like faith; but in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economics they want no opinions but their own. They have no idea that such matters are, like physical matters, under the control of natural laws—that to find those laws, or learn those already found, must require special study; and that to go counter to them, in ignorance, must bring disaster as fatally as in perversity. Since the discovery of the law of the Conservation of Energy, attempts to make perpetual-motion machines have about disappeared; and when the operation of that law in Economics is made as plain as it is in Physics, the various perpetual-motion schemes of finance and industry will also disappear. Probably the readiest opening to the conception of Universal Law is in Physics. This is "practically" important too, in industrial training. After enough of it is mastered to open the way to the elementary conceptions of Astronomy, they might well be the next step toward the great conception of Universal Law. Then, toward the same end would follow some elementary biological conceptions, which are also "practically" justifiable, as a ready basis for hygienic and sanitary knowledge. They would include that most important general conception already alluded to, of the survival of the fittest. From this, the transition to the survival of the psychically fit is easy, and thus the standpoint is reached for a view of Law in non-material things. I am perfectly aware that to some, all this will appear too great an undertaking, and it certainly does seem a long way beyond our habitual stupid methods. I believe, however, that in half the time which, when I was a boy, was devoted to superfluous arithmetical "problems" and the fine-spun spider-webs of grammar, and by such simple methods as I have tried to indicate for Economics, there could be given a serviceable amount of the essential conceptions, or at least a quantity of correct dogmas that later would breed thought and open the mind to its reception. There is hardly a doctrine in this series of papers that I have not preached, in some shape, to working-men and working-boys, and I think that they understood them. But even if they cannot be taught to the children, let them at least be taught to their teachers; for I believe, in fact I know, that where these ideas are diffused among the elders and the instructed, they filter down to the children and the ignorant.

I have probably appeared to many readers, perhaps to most, to lay out a fantastic scheme for the public schools and the average child; but I venture to say that a generation or two hence, the existing scheme will be regarded as vastly more fantastic. Affluent details of grammar, logico-arithmetical puzzles, and Indian stories called

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

history, are fantastic occupations for children who, above all, need to be taught to keep house, make a living, and vote.

The working-man needs, then, not only instruction in the trade-school and in certain economic facts, but the kind of instruction in science and history that will give him some conceptions of Natural Law. On the basis thus provided, could be built some notion of its control in the social as well as in the material world; and also some realization that human law is futile, or worse, except, as by close study and cautious experiment, it is made to conform to the Natural Law. Hence would come the faith that no human law can make the unfit survive, except at somebody else's expense; and that the only way to enable them to survive at their own, is to make them fit.

But the people's faith in artificial law is of course great just in inverse ratio to their faith in natural law. I have been criticised for saying that it is about as impracticable to equalize the distribution of wealth, as that of youth and beauty: the argument against the doctrine being that legislation is constantly regulating the distribution of wealth. Yes: it is constantly making the distribution more unequal and the production less, by crazy attempts to equalize the distribution; and the prayer of all real authorities is that so far as exigencies of revenue permit, legislation should leave the matter alone. A striking illustration of the character of these schemes was given in a recent magazine article by the Governor of that perennially instructive Kansas. He supports debasement of the coinage, because it would raise prices for the suffering farmers of his State, and seems utterly oblivious of the fact that such debasements come hardest on first-hand producers, like farmers, because they have to pay the enhanced price not only of all first-hand production except their own, but of all middlemen's services besides. What wonder that a State so guided is suffering! A collateral point may excusably be alluded to here. Our abundant land is taking into independent production hosts of people who are not fit for it—people who, under ordinary circumstances, would be getting along well under the management of somebody else. That, no less than some recent deplorable disasters, is responsible, I feel confident, for the distress in so many of our new States. But to return: in the whole realm of jurisprudence, so far as the mass of people touch it, they believe in schemes made to order. They believe thus, partly because they have no appreciation of the systems slowly evolved through the ages, in response to natural necessity—systems of which our inherited common

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law, and, perhaps it would not be too much to say, our freedom itself, are the greatest examples. The "history" generally taught, instead of illustrating these facts, as it might in many elementary ways, has been mainly tales of war, adventure and court gossip.

Still another of the oft-said things that cannot be said too often is, that the more ignorant a man, the greater is apt to be his faith, not only that anybody can make a statute that will do anything, but also that a good statute, once made, will do the work by itself: he needs illustration after illustration that a statute is at best but a machine, and a machine that will respond to no inert fuel of mine or forest, but demands the power and conscience of living men.

One more commonplace to round out this department of the subject, and I have done with it. General political education, which of course must be moral as well as intellectual, would enable men to elect administrators who could be trusted to do much for the general good that, especially in America, and more especially in its cities, those elected can seldom be trusted to do now; it would enable the whole community to secure the benefit of such natural monopolies as could then be reasonably handled by the Government, and vastly more of the recreative and intellectual resources too immense for private creation—parks, drives, libraries, museums and public *fêtes*—ceremonial and artistic and intellectual.

And now, having tried to indicate the essentials of the more specifically intellectual education still needed, we have naturally attained the borders of the more definitely moral one. It is of course involved in intellectual education, especially regarding Contract and the Economic Value of Honesty. But in its distinct character, it is needed by many whose intellectual education is, in our lame way, provided for: so what I have to say on this point will apply, even less than what I have said before, to any particular class or condition of men. The moral social education we all need seems, even more than the intellectual, to be expressible by simple old saws. Perhaps two of them include it all—"Help others," "Depend upon yourself."

An intellectual appreciation of the relations of moral precepts is, however, very essential to their effectiveness—perhaps because so many have been unwise, and so many more have been impressed by unwise sanctions.

Since everybody has been reading Mr. Benjamin Kidd, it is perhaps superfluous to enlarge upon the general influence of altru-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ism in elevating the condition of the lowly. But Mr. Kidd treats altruism as something irrational or "ultra-rational," and a mere *apanage* of religion. To this I want to take exception, partly because the working-man sometimes seems to have pretty much broken with religion. He held to it while it helped him endure, and while he had to do a great deal of enduring—the slave held to it very enthusiastically, in his way, but is not so adherent since he ceased to be a slave. But the working-man in general, as well as the freedman, has not to endure so much now, and what is making him discontented is the passion to enjoy. It is in the light of this passion that he so often says: "Religion never did anything for me." He is mistaken, but the reader knows how to correct him, and I need not enlarge on that side. It is true, though, that he wants a stronger sanction for any belief than the dogmatic one, and if you are going to educate him into an intelligent appreciation of the competitive order of the universe, and coöperation with it, and so rid him of his wasteful and destructive efforts to set up an order of his own, you have got to show him that competition is not inconsistent with altruism, and that altruism rests on some foundation that he still believes in. Now anybody who knows a little of the birds and beasts and of the law of evolution, knows that altruism, even independently of the semi-selfish parental relation, is older than religion, or than man himself; and anybody who has ever lent a hand in any judicious labor for the lowly, has been unfortunate indeed if he does not know that altruism, instead of being "irrational" or "ultra-rational," simply *pays*—pays in growth of knowledge and character, not to speak of the reflected glow which cheers the soul. So true is this, that many of the most benevolent of men have wondered whether, at bottom, altruism was not selfishness, after all. Let us realize, then, that this fast-growing power for the elevation of the race is not irrational or ultra-rational, but is as firmly rooted in the system of things as reason itself, and therefore must be consistent with the reason which that system has evolved.

And now as to the relations of altruism and competition. I said in THE FORUM for February that one might as well try to do away with gravitation as with competition. I regret that the course of my thought did not lead me to insert the word *suddenly*, although the context implied, I trust, that such was my meaning. We know, as well as we know anything outside of experience, that even gravitation is an affair of cycles; and it is within experience that competition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sometimes passes away. But its passing depends on so many complex influences that no power of man can suddenly complete the process. The same complexity makes the subject a dangerous one to handle, and I want to be understood as treating it with misgiving. This much, however, we know—that a large part of what passes for competition is really violent or fraudulent restraint of it; that as competition is growing free, it is rapidly diminishing in ferocity and unfairness; that among primitive peoples, tribal competition for food and place is constant war; that in the higher nations, baser competition is now being supplanted by competition before arbitrators; that in civilization, the rough competition of individual war has been supplanted by contests in the courts; and even the courts, by arbitrations; and that in industry, the competition of chicane and ruinous "opposition" prices, is giving way to the competition of honesty and economy in production and exchange. In the professions and the most advanced trades, it is no longer true that "two of a trade can't agree," but while business rivalry is more and more restricted to doing the best possible for the public, personal relations of business competitors are marked by increasing friendliness and interchange of good offices. "In the swamp" and "on the street," when undeserved misfortune threatens a house, instead of the rest rejoicing that a rival is about to disappear, they are more apt to unite to pull him through. This spirit is not restricted to "equals": the world is dotted with spots made bright by the efforts of employers to increase the happiness of their employees. Moreover, we already have, in small but rapidly-increasing number, men making fortunes in generous competition, and using them with altruism. The struggle for existence, with its concomitant of the destruction of the least fit, is mainly a feature of the ante-human stages of evolution, as it ought to be. Existence once secured, the struggle for it ceases, and with the growth in men of a capacity to provide for the future, existence for the whole of life is often secured at a time long before its close. From that time, effort need not longer be selfish, and most properly becomes altruistic. These words sound to me like direct echoes of Spencer, and possibly are entitled to the honor of being so considered, though happily the air is now becoming full of them everywhere. Let us realize, however, that "Existence" is a broad term, and may reasonably be interpreted by a civilized and refined being to mean the existence of a civilized and refined being. But after such an existence is secured, to continue the struggle for the sake of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

something more, is only to lessen the existence that the highest-evolved beings care for—to incur hardening of character, loss of susceptibility to the nobler emotions, heavy cares, and probably the enervations of excess. The only warrants for farther participation in the struggle are adding to and cheapening the world's desirable commodities, and using the superfluity that comes to one's self for the benefit of others. Industry protracted from such motives, it need hardly be said, promotes evolution of both the actor and the race, and is among the noblest and most unfailing sources of happiness. Otherwise, after reasonable needs are supplied, continuance of the struggle is a degrading indulgence at the expense of others, and, under the law of evolution, is open to objections differing only in degree from those against robbery.

When Nature evolved altruism, she really evolved a new force in the struggle for existence, no less than when she evolved locomotion and sight and hearing. If you doubt it, think what the Turk has accomplished as a conqueror and colonizer, and what the Briton. One has acted solely for self, and has accomplished—suicide. The other, while selfish enough, still has had some thought for the conquered peoples, and has accomplished—evolution. It is a sad thing for the poor to antagonize that altruistic spirit by attempting to seize by force what can have permanent value only as bestowed by good-will. I heard a man somewhat given to good works say, soon after the income-tax law was passed: "Oh, well! If that's their game, I'll simply deduct the amount of my tax from my charities." But the altruistic spirit is hard to kill, and I have seen signs of wavering in that disposition.

The second of our saws: "Depend upon yourself," has some implications that were among those marvellous insights of the great teacher of Nazareth. They were dimly set forth in such assertions as that he who hath faith can move mountains, and were illustrated in the responses which the lame and afflicted made to his assurances that they could do what they saw fit to believe they could. A revival of the same healing is to-day marvellously illustrating the power of self-reliance. That power may come from some reserve-force in the soul, or, for all we know, it may even be some long-neglected rill from the one force of the Universe, poured into the soul that rightly opens itself to receive. Whatever it may be, woe to all teachings and statutes—to all dependence upon charity or upon legislation—that tends to take from any man the help of that!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But after all is taught, can we reasonably hope that self-reliance, and with it industry, frugality, and intelligence, will ever become so general that the social discontent will be relieved? From one aspect, it is not desirable that it should be. Some form of discontent is the basis of all effort, and hence of all progress. The "contentment" that has inspired poets and moralists connotes, as perhaps all objects of enthusiasm do, but one side of the truth. What is really advocated is the guiding of discontent away from the miasmatic pools of worry, into the power-giving streams of action: better still if it could, as perhaps in time it can, be removed from the slavery of necessity, and to the divine unrest of aspiration. But so long as painful contrasts of condition remain, it is no more desirable that the social discontent cease than probable that it will. The only serious question, then, is whether men can ultimately reach a substantial equality of condition.

Despite the cry of "rich richer and poor poorer," that there has been a rise in the condition of the manual laborer is an established commonplace. The mind involuntarily travels from the slaves on whom Cleopatra tried her poisons, to the New England farmer going to the legislature or a governor's chair. The effect of the great industry on increasing labor's income and cheapening its outgo is now so well established that the trade-unions themselves are becoming friendly to the introduction of machinery. It is by no means difficult to realize that with its aid, and that of various new processes in chemistry and molecular physics, all salutary wants are being satisfied with vastly less manual labor and less disagreeable labor than before. Statistics prove that the proportion of laborers in the most disagreeable tasks has already been enormously decreased. On the other side, it is not hard to conceive a time when the manager and inventor and capitalist who now afflict themselves with dumb-bells and pounding on horse-back around a sawdust ring, will be glad to find a substitute, as they would now if it were practicable, in a share of the world's manual work. Old Lyman Beecher keeping a sand-heap to toss about his cellar, and Horace Greeley and Mr. Gladstone felling trees, are suggestive figures. But to believe that this equality is going to come by a revolution of the agencies that have so far built up civilization, instead of by an evolution from them, is too absurd to be considered, even by the more intelligent of the sentimentalists: even they seek some possible evolutionary transition from the existing order to the order of their dreams. Mr. Bellamy himself proposes to find it in the trusts, making them a connecting link between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individualism and state-Socialism. But, with the consistency of his school, he proposes to use the power of self-interest to do away with self-interest! The first condition of the successful management of the trusts is the very condition which would make the obtaining of equally good management for state-Socialism impossible—the managers are working for themselves. When similar men get into control of state interests, they continue *working for themselves:* the idealism of character which makes the devoted public servant is not characteristic of the successful manager of industry: nor are the virtues which demand a trustworthy public servant characteristic of the average voter. The change in human nature necessary to provide either of those two essentials of a socialistic state are too far out of sight to build on now. Both might exist in an altruistic society, but you have got to evolve both in numbers impossible for a long time yet, before you can get your altruistic society. Yet, as I have said before, that some such society is, in the future, to be evolved under conditions now apparent, is by no means a paradoxical dream. But all evolution must proceed under Natural Selection, and however much natural processes can be promoted by human intelligence, they must still always be waited for.

And now, finally, shall we seek an answer to the terrible question whether modern civilization is to go the way of the earlier civilizations, before its elevating work on the great masses of mankind raises them materially nearer the level of the favored few than they were raised in the civilizations which are gone? From the inductive point of view, I have touched the question already; and to any candid mind it must show that the difference is rapidly diminishing. From the deductive point of view, the mind habituated to the philosophy of evolution is apt to fly at once into the vague glories which fringe the law of equilibration. But in the present state of our knowledge, those glories are so vague that Fancy can spread her wings among them to but moderate purpose. We do know, however, that evolution tends to equilibration; and that equilibration in the affairs of men must mean equality in capacity, attainment, and happiness; and that, too, not by levelling down, but by levelling up. But as evolution is a fact, so is dissolution, and so is cataclysm; and in all previous civilizations, one or both have intervened, even before equilibration was as near as now. Yet we have one tremendous reliance that they had not, in the general study of the Kosmos itself, the growing mastery of Kosmic forces, and the growing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allegiance to Kosmic Law. Some think that we have a second new great power, in a religion whose examples are altruistic instead of egoistic. That cannot be claimed, though, for the "old dispensation"; and the claim of uniqueness in that respect for the august examples in the new, would be disputed by the Buddhist and some others whose civilizations have declined. But aside from the two great agencies I have named, there is also hope in the fact that beyond all civilizations that have passed, and including them, has progressed *the* civilization, which, though Mesopotamia and Egypt and Greece and Rome are dead, is to-day the heir of them all. The progress has, it is true, been spasmodic, or rhythmic, as philosophy says and as the law of evolution requires; but nevertheless it has been persistent. I can see but one great danger looming in front, and that is the sentimentality which, while yearning for the advance, is constantly befogging the way, and has, in the ballot, put the means of destruction into the hands of the ignorant and venal. But the growing influence of science is fast wiping out both the sentimentality and the ignorance—and even the venality; and it may make possible the continuance of our evolution. Now so long as evolution persists, equilibration is its goal. Recent centuries show men growing nearer together in riches, wisdom, happiness, and mutual helpfulness—that too, at a progressive rate which, through ways that we can dimly see and humbly promote, ought to bring about, in a time perhaps not needing to be measured by centuries, an approach to social equilibration that will leave little room for the social discontent.

HENRY HOLT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WOMEN IN EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES.

WHEN the history of this century comes to be written, even the most conservative historian will have to find a place for the "Rise of Woman." Not that the growth of her influence is a new thing: it is simply a return such as the cycles of history bring with it; yet, as is natural in a democratic age, it is fuller and extends more widely than ever before. One of the most interesting developments is the opening, or in some cases the reopening, of the universities to women —a movement that began in America, and has by this time spread over nearly the whole of Europe. I shall write of this movement in three countries: England, France, and Germany.

English universities may be divided into two classes: the ancient seats of learning, Oxford and Cambridge, which grew out of the old monastic system, and yet retain many mediæval customs; and modern institutions, such as London, Durham, and Victoria universities, and the infant University of Wales. It is just twenty-five years since the first attempts were made to obtain university education for women in England, and many are the changes this quarter of a century has seen. The first fortress to be assailed was Cambridge. In October, 1869, a hired house was opened at Hitchin, about fifteen miles from Cambridge, for the reception of a few students. Here they received instruction from Cambridge men, who were generous enough to lend sympathy and practical help; and among those who came first to the aid of the embryo college were such eminent men as the late Professor Seeley and Dr. Hort. Owing to further kindness on the part of the university examiners, the students were informally examined by the same papers as were set to the men. From the first the college rule was to keep terms and pass examinations according to all the regulations laid down for members of Cambridge University, and thus prepare the way for the time when the University should openly acknowledge its women-students. This determination has proved of incalculable advantage to the college. The largest number of students in residence at the same time at Hitchin was thirteen. In January, 1872, an association was formed and incorporated as a college;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and in 1873 it removed to Girton, one and one-half miles from Cambridge, where it has continued to grow and prosper.

The beginnings of Newnham were different. In 1870 lectures for women were started in Cambridge, and in 1871, to meet the demands of women from a distance who wished to attend them, Miss A. J. Clough[1] took charge of a small house for students; thence they removed to Newnham Hall in 1875. Additional members required additional buildings, and Newnham grew fast. In 1880 the association for providing lectures and the association for providing a hall of residence were together incorporated as Newnham College. Both Girton and Newnham now work regularly for the honors examinations of the University, but there is a little more readiness on the part of Newnham to admit women, under special circumstances, who may not wish to take the full university course.

In 1881 women received their first formal acknowledgment from Cambridge. The University Senate passed three resolutions or "graces," the effect of which was (1) to admit female students who have fulfilled the conditions respecting length of residence and standing, which members of the University are expected to fulfil, to the previous examination and the tripos examinations; (2) such residence must be held at Girton College or Newnham College, or within the precincts of the University, at one or other of these colleges, or in any similar institution within the precincts of the University, which the University shall in future approve; (3) the women's colleges are required to give certificates of residence in the same form as those required of the men; (4) they may be exempted from passing the previous examination, by an honor certificate of the Cambridge higher local examination, provided this includes mathematics and a language; (5) the "ordinary degree" examination is not open to them, but if they fail to obtain honors in a tripos examination, yet attain the standard required for an ordinary degree, this must be stated by the examiners.

These "graces" were supplemented in 1884 by a further one regarding the buildings for women,—their suitability and management. This marks the latest action on the part of the University; for a petition, presented in 1887, asking that degrees should be conferred on women, was rejected. At present, therefore, women-students are formally acknowledged by Cambridge, not in their individual capac-

[1] See an article on Newnham College, by Miss Clough, in THE FORUM for November, 1891.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ity as members of the University, but corporately as members of the women's colleges, which have been definitely connected with the University. In regard to residence and tripos examinations, they are under the same regulations as the men, but in regard to other examinations there are differences. Women are excused a very easy preliminary examination on the ground of its being too hard; but they are excluded from an inferior final examination on the ground of its being too easy!

Women may attend any of the University lectures, as these are free and open to all. Besides these each college holds lectures of its own, and to some of these members of other colleges are admitted. In these cases students of Girton and Newnham can almost always obtain admittance, but a college tutor or a lecturer has the power to refuse it. When once permission is granted, no further request need be made, and the lecture in question is considered permanently open to women students. Of course the University has no jurisdiction in this matter; and, as the colleges are residential, it depends much on the construction of the building, and the position of the lecture rooms, whether it is possible to admit women.

The University of Cambridge grants no degree to women, and this is their most serious grievance, and one which cries out for early redress, since their position is apt to be misunderstood outside the precincts of the University, and particularly in foreign countries. Instead the University confers a certificate (which men do not receive) stating that the woman in question has passed the required preliminary examination, kept the required number of terms, passed the examination of the particular tripos, and been placed in a certain class. The certificates are signed by the vice-chancellor, and bear the University seal. The women's class-list is printed in the University calendar after the men's. Admission to the tripos examinations admits women to the study of classics, mathematics, natural science, history, philosophy, modern languages, Oriental languages, law and theology, but not of medicine. They may take the examination for a degree in music.

At Oxford matters are not very dissimilar, though the history of the movement has passed through different stages. In 1878 the Association for the Higher Education of Women was started at Oxford, and the arrangements in regard to women's studies have always been in its hands, instead of in the direction of the individual colleges. The course for a degree at Oxford requires three examinations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Most of the university lectures and many college lectures are open to women; and the Association holds lectures in subjects not provided for by the University. Oxford makes no inquiries as to the residence of its women students, but this is arranged for by their colleges—Somerville College, Lady Margaret Hall, and St. Hugh's Hall.

By special arrangement with the authorities women may use the libraries and museums. They receive a certificate, not from the University, but from the delegacy of the local examinations. Hence their connection with the University is less formal than that of their sisters at Cambridge; but here too they have obtained the substance, though the formal acknowledgment by the right to use the degree will be immensely valuable when once it is obtained.

At London University events moved much more rapidly. The University was founded in 1836, chiefly for the sake of Nonconformists, who were at that time excluded by the tests from Oxford and Cambridge. It is an examining and degree-conferring body, and takes no cognizance of the residence or means of study of its members. There is a project now on foot for converting it into a teaching as well as examining university, but this project has met with some formidable opposition. There are several colleges in London which prepare for the examinations, *e.g.*, University (men and women), King's (men), Bedford (women), and some also in the provinces. Some students prepare by private study, some even by correspondence. This constitution and the liberal intentions of the founders, manifested in their motto *Cuncti adsint*, naturally facilitated any such innovation as the admission of women. In 1868 an "Examination for Women" was started, which exactly corresponded to the matriculation examination of the University. This showed the capacity of the women who entered for it; and the next step was their full admission. As the charter of 1836 only acknowledged male students, a fresh charter had to be obtained. This was granted in 1878, and thenceforth women were freely admitted to all the faculties:—arts, science, medicine, law, music. London has no theological faculty. A special medical school for women was opened; and as the London medical degrees take the highest standing in this country, women have the less reason to complain of being excluded from the medical schools of Oxford and Cambridge. At London women take part in the government of the University; for Convocation is made up of all doctors and masters, and bachelors of two or three years' standing, who pay the necessary small fee. The Senate is partly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elected by Convocation. Women are thus entirely on a level with men, except that they do not vote for a member of Parliament.

Victoria is a still more recent institution. It was founded in 1880, when the principle of women's study was already established in England. Manchester is its centre, but it comprises the three university colleges of Manchester, Liverpool, and Leeds. The charter distinctly states that the University will examine for its degrees "all persons, male and female, who shall have pursued a regular course of study in a college in the University." Unfortunately one disability exists even here. The colleges do not admit women to their medical schools; and though the medical degree is open to women, it is not easy for them to obtain the instruction. Probably at some future time there will be a special medical school for women here. At present the feeling in England seems to be in favor of separate medical teaching for men and women, and joint instruction in other subjects. At Victoria, as in London, the registered graduates form Convocation, and this elects part of the University council.

The newest University is Wales. The charter which formed the three university colleges of Bangor, Cardiff, and Aberystwith into one university, was granted only last year. It contains the following clause: "Women shall be eligible equally with men for admittance to any Degree which the University is by this our Charter authorized to confer; every office hereby created in the University and the membership of every Authority hereby constituted shall be open to women equally with men." The governing body is the University Court. Some of its members *must* by charter be women. The University Senate consists of the principals of the constituent colleges, and such professors or lecturers as are heads of departments in these colleges. Under this clause, there is at present one lady member of the Senate, one of the heads of the department of education. This Welsh charter marks the last stage of the victory; for it is a pledge that no future charter will be granted in England that does not place men and women on an absolute equality.

Durham is the last of all to acknowledge women, and this is probably due to the close connection between the University and the Cathedral, and the special importance of its theological degrees. But the spirit of the times has penetrated even here, and a petition has been sent up asking leave to alter the charter in such a way as to confer degrees, in all subjects except theology, on duly qualified women. Before long, therefore, we shall hear of lady-graduates of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Durham. When Oxford and Cambridge give the degree, the victory will have been won all along the line.

The history of women's studies in France is in striking contrast to that of England and Germany. In these two countries, the desire for study originated in the women; and it was they who came knocking, first unheeded, at the doors of learning, which opened slowly, at first by inches, then wider and wider. France knows of no such struggle. The doors of her universities were never closed to women, though it is probable that no one realized this fact, until the first adventurous woman found that she had but to knock and walk in. When the women wished to study, they found the lectures open, for instruction at the French universities is public and gratuitous. Lectures are divided into *cours ouverts* and *cours fermés;* the former open to all, the latter, in theory, only to matriculated students, *i.e.*, those that have passed the *baccalauréat*, and taken a certain number of *inscriptions*. As a matter of fact any one who wishes seriously to pursue his studies can generally obtain admission. There is no college system as in England; no question is asked about residence, and the disciplinary control is of the most shadowy character.

Perhaps this very ease tended to check the ardor of aspirants. Certain it is that the number of Frenchwomen who have fully qualified themselves for the degrees of the University of France is very small. The ordinary course for a degree at a French University is (1) *baccalauréat*, (2) *licence*, (3) *doctorat*. The *baccalauréat* is a kind of matriculation examination; the boys' *lycées* prepare their pupils for it, but it is open to all candidates, male and female. The *licence* is an intermediate examination, but for many it is the goal of their studies. At least a year must elapse between the *baccalauréat* and the *licence*. For the degree of doctor, theses have to be written, and sustained before the faculty. But a small proportion of students proceed to this degree. The number of men who take the *licence* is very great, because it confers a special immunity: one year's service instead of three in the army. Of course this inducement does not apply to women; and so long as the University degree did not lead the way to professional employment, it was a luxury for the intellectual few.

Thus it is natural that, in France, the medical degree should have been the first coveted by female students. The medical school in Paris, which is distinct from the Sorbonne and takes fees from its students, was first opened to women in 1868, when Wurtz, the cele-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brated chemist, was *doyen* of the faculty. At first only three availed themselves of the permission; after ten years, the number had not risen above thirty-two. At the present moment there are one hundred and sixty-nine. Of these only sixteen are French women, and a large majority are Russians and Poles.

The great impulse to female study came in the year 1881 from the law *Camille Sée*. This established *lycées* for girls, and decreed that the teachers in these should be women, so soon as there were any capable of filling the posts. Here was a sudden impulse to study, with a tangible concrete result at the end of it. Together with the foundation of the *lycées* went the creation of a number of new degrees meant for women only, some of them bearing the old familiar names.

The different character of the examinations requires different preparation, and the centre of the instruction for the women's degrees is not the Sorbonne but Sèvres, where women teachers are prepared for the *lycées*. Here they work for the *certificat d'aptitude*, and the *agrégation*. The college is supported by the state; students on entrance sign an agreement promising to teach under the state ten years after leaving; and the successful candidates have the first right to vacant posts in public schools. Private classes may also prepare for these examinations; in particular the *College Sévigné* holds such. The Sorbonne holds classes in preparation for the modern language examinations, and these are attended by men and women alike. Technically very few of the female hearers are students, as the majority have not passed the *baccalauréat*, but there is nothing to prevent their fulfilling the conditions and becoming students in theory as well as in fact.

Though Paris is the centre of French education, there are centres of learning in other towns. Technically there is only one university, the University of France, which alone has the degree-giving power; and this has departments (*facultés*) in Paris and fifteen other towns. Every such department has four faculties: arts (*lettres*), science, medicine, and law; and some, like Paris, have also Protestant theology. All four have now been invaded by women, though the number of law students is small. The first female student entered seven years ago. She was a Roumanian, and after taking the doctor's degree at Paris was allowed to practise at the bar, in her own country. The only other "*doctoresse*" is a French lady, who gives lessons in civil law at the girls' *lycées* in Paris. There seems no opening at present for lady lawyers in France, and therefore this faculty is not likely to attract many women. The total number of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

female students of law does not exceed six. This is natural under present conditions, but so far as concerns the right of receiving instruction and the degree which stamps the successful student, women have nothing left to ask of the University of France.

Of all European countries, Germany is the last to realize the necessity of giving her daughters a higher education. But even here the time of awakening seems to be at hand. Very slowly the desire of the women is making itself felt, but in spite of the tyranny of the past there can be little doubt of the ultimate victory.

In Germany the problem of a wider sphere for women's work and education presents some aspects that are foreign to America and England. The aim of a German university is not so much the production of a large cultivated class, who will be helped either directly or indirectly in their future work by the training there received; but its aim is rather to equip them fully for one particular kind of work. Hence comes a sort of trades-union feeling among the learned—a desire to limit the number of candidates for every post. It was a common complaint in Germany even before the Emperor expressed it with his brutal candor, that the universities turned out more learned men (*Gelehrte*) than the country required. "And now the women want to come and swell our numbers!" cry the men in wrath. Again in Germany there is a very strong feeling that the men have a right to determine how the women should be educated, in order that the result of the process may be most pleasing to themselves. The women, too, have been so long accustomed to bow to the men's dictum that they might have continued satisfied, had they not been confronted by the stern question of maintenance. Here, as elsewhere, the number of women dependent on their own earnings is increasing from year to year; sentiment and inborn submissiveness must disappear before stern reality; a means of livelihood must be found.

The example of other countries pointed the way. Women who had received their training elsewhere settled in Germany as physicians, and the German women gradually came to recognize their value. But this career was open only to those who could study in other countries. Then the work which, in America and England, is regarded as essentially a woman's,—teaching in schools,—is in Germany very largely in the hands of men. In the great majority of the public girls' schools in Germany the middle and upper classes are taught by masters, who often have even charge of the class. Such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subjects as religion, history, literature, and languages are supposed to be peculiarly their province. In private schools women play a more important part, but even here the best posts are usually held by men. If the women aspired to the better positions, they were told, with much truth, that their training did not fit them for the work. How were they to obtain a better training?

Until a very few years ago, all the preparation for her work received by a woman-teacher was the training of the *Lehrerinnen-Seminar*, which she usually left at the age of eighteen or nineteen, when still a school-girl, and instructed only by school methods, second-hand knowledge, and a large mass of memory-work. The examination she had to pass included religious knowledge, German, arithmetic, history, geography, natural history, a little physics and chemistry, a little pedagogy, singing, drawing, calisthenics, needle-work, with the addition of French and English for those who wished to teach in schools above primary schools. Obviously no really scholarly knowledge is possible of so many subjects at such an early age. The examination, which is largely oral, is really a test of memory and of ability to impart knowledge to junior classes. A teacher whose education and training were considered ended at the age of eighteen could not expect to rise above the lower grades. The dissatisfaction at this state of things has been growing of late. It is hard on the mistresses that they should be shut out from the higher instruction and better salaries, and hard on the girls that they should miss the sympathy and influence of women teachers at an age when it is likely to be most beneficial to them. Thus the demand for higher education for women in Germany is largely based on the necessity of providing women doctors and teachers.

In the year 1887 a petition was presented to the Ministry of Education and Parliament of Prussia, accompanied by a pamphlet written by Helene Lange, one of the pioneers in this work. The petition contented itself with the very moderate demands that women should be allowed to take some part in the higher teaching in the public schools, especially in German and religious knowledge, and that measures should be taken to provide education which should fit women to undertake this work. Moderate as these demands appear, they called forth a storm of controversy. Even those who inclined in their favor emphasized the desirability of the predominance of the male element in each school. The petition itself had no direct result, but indirectly it led to work on two different lines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Berlin there was already an institution that aimed at the higher education of women—the Victoria Lyceum, founded under the patronage of the Empress Frederick (then Crown Princess of Prussia) by Miss Archer. From small beginnings it grew to be a college of some importance, though in no way connected with the University, and without any systematic arrangement of courses or power to grant degrees. In 1888, through the influence of the Empress Frederick, a small sum of money was granted toward establishing advanced classes for teachers. These were to be on the lines of what is known as a university *Seminar*. Each course was to occupy three years; the treatment to be thoroughly scientific and lead to independent work from original authorities. At the end of the three years there was to be an examination, which, it was hoped, would win good posts in schools for the successful candidates. On these lines the examination was first held in 1891.

Soon afterwards Göttingen followed suit. Through the energy of Fraulein Vorwerk, of Wolfenbüttel, courses of lectures to women were started. These are all given by university professors, many of whom have been most kind and helpful in supporting the undertaking. Sometimes these lectures are identically the same as those delivered to the men. In fact the Göttingen *Fortbildungskurse* might be compared to an "annex" or women's college connected loosely with the University, were it not that the previous training of its students differs entirely from that required by the University. The women must have passed the *Lehrerinnenexamen* and have taught for five years since. Neither classics nor mathematics are required; and most students have had no opportunity of instruction in these subjects.

Last May for the first time the state set its seal on this undertaking. By a resolution of the Prussian Minister of Education, an examination for the title of head teacher (*Oberlehrerin*) is to be held every year. The subjects of examination are classed in two groups: religious knowledge, German, French, English; and history, geography, mathematics, natural science. Each candidate must take two subjects, one out of the first group and a second out of either. The examination consists of two parts: a thesis on a given subject prepared at home during a period of six, or in some cases ten, weeks; and an oral examination, conducted in such a way as to test the power of the candidate rather than her verbal memory.

By these regulations the course is reduced to two years, and two subjects instead of one are required. This must tend somewhat to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lower the standard; but the nature of the work required and the character of the examination are such as to bear some relation to university work, even in the high interpretation that the Germans give to this term. To provide some stimulus to enter for examination, the minister lays down that in future, in all girls' schools of which the principal is a man, a woman shall be associated with him in the management, and at least one of the three upper classes shall be in the hands of a woman. A great concession in German eyes!

Thus a very important beginning has been made. But this does not touch the medical training of women, nor the preparation of those who aspire to take a full university course. The supporters of women's education cannot rest content until they have secured the full opening of the universities.

In Germany there is but one "open sesame" to this door, the *Abiturientenexamen*. As a rule this is the leaving examination of the gymnasium (classical high school), but in some of the states outside Prussia the certificate of a *Realgymnasium* (German high school) suffices. This does not require Greek; and in Prussia, too, this is sufficient for students of natural science, but not of medicine. In 1889 classes for girls on the lines of a *Realgymnasium* were started at Berlin. In 1893 these were transformed into regular gymnasium classes, including Greek. This was followed by the establishment of similar classes at Leipzig, while both of these had been preceded by the establishment of a school at Carlsrühe, on somewhat different and apparently less successful lines. At Berlin and Leipzig no girls are admitted under the age of sixteen. They must have passed through the course of the *höhere Mädchenschule*, which formerly ended at sixteen, but under the new regulations may be left at fifteen. It is thought that by beginning late, when considerable mastery has been gained over some of the other subjects required, *e.g.*, religious knowledge, German, arithmetic, it will prove possible to concentrate the nine years' work of the gymnasium into three or four. It is in fact much like the principle of an American classical high school. It is worthy of note that the recent changes in the boys' schools, under which the amount of Greek required and the Latin composition are considerably reduced, will greatly favor the plan. So far the zeal and energy of the girls have responded to the most sanguine hopes of the promoters, but no class has, as yet, been ready to graduate; and therefore, though an inspection of these schools leaves a most satisfactory impression, it is hardly safe to indulge in prophecy. These

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

girls' gymnasia and the teachers' classes are two different paths leading to the same end, the opening of the universities. The former will supply the needful preliminary training, the latter will prove the power of women to appreciate higher studies.

A third converging line is afforded by the attendance of a few individuals, usually foreigners, at some of the university classes. About two years ago the Prussian Minister of Education applied to the universities in the kingdom, asking their opinion on the admission of women. The answers were all negative, but there was a difference in the degree of opposition. Things, therefore, went on as before. At Berlin, where there is a strong hostile feeling in the University Senate, it is very difficult for a woman to gain admittance. Occasionally a professor grants admission to one of his own courses, but this is *sub rosa*, and almost every member of the University, if asked the question, will assert that no woman is ever admitted. As a matter of fact six women are attending lectures there this winter.

Berlin as the capital and seat of a very large university is not the most fruitful soil for experiment. Göttingen is far more hospitably inclined. For the last year or two a few women, chiefly American and English, have attended single courses by special permission. A few months ago, one of the leading professors, who had been among the first to welcome lady-pupils, proposed their admission to the philosophical faculty, which here includes philology, history, natural science, and mathematics. To the surprise of all present, since each member expected to be almost the only supporter, the resolution was carried by a large majority. Its purport is to allow women, who can prove by certificates from some other university or college that they possess sufficient preliminary knowledge, to attend the lectures as well as take part in the *Seminarübungen* in this faculty; and they may, if they please, present themselves for the degree of Ph. D. Under this regulation there are at present twelve women studying at Göttingen, in addition to those who attend the teachers' classes. When students who have passed the *Abiturientenexamen* present themselves, it is probable that they will be allowed to matriculate, and enter with full status.

Leipzig has hitherto proved less generous, although a considerable number of women do attend lectures there, and some of them are admitted to the Seminary, but are not allowed to take part in the exercises. Each professor uses his own judgment about their admission, but in theory their presence at lectures is forbidden. Their position

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is very anomalous; some pay fees for their lectures—others do not. They have absolutely no status and cannot proceed to a degree. Still, for women who wish to spend a year or two in post-graduate study, Leipzig offers many advantages.

Heidelberg has actually gone the length of withdrawing concessions previously granted. A good many years ago, women could easily obtain admission to lectures, and many foreigners availed themselves of this privilege. Some time ago, this permission was withdrawn, for reasons that it is not easy to discover. The question has been reconsidered several times, and at last one of the faculties, the department of natural science and mathematics, decided by a small majority to admit women to lectures, and allow them to proceed to the degree. Each case must, however, be considered singly, first by the whole faculty, then by the professor concerned. In the philosophical faculty (including philology) one lady has obtained admission to lectures *as an exception*. Her admission is not to be a precedent, but it is probable that other exceptions will be allowed, provided that the applicants can prove that their aim is genuine study.

As yet only one woman has taken a degree at Heidelberg and that in philology. This is Miss Windscheid, who studied at Leipzig, but might not be examined there. Probably other women will follow in her footsteps, for the objection at Heidelberg seems to be stronger against the presence of women at lectures than against admission to the degree. At Freiburg, also in Baden, it seems a little easier to obtain admission to lectures, and some medical lectures have even been attended, but this is not of very much use to German women until the state opens its medical examinations to them.

As we glance back over the position of university women in these three countries—France with its unconditional equality to all who fulfil the necessary conditions; England moving on slowly "from precedent to precedent" to the same great end; Germany half-sunk in darkness yet, but with glimpses of light showing here and there—we recognize that all are moving in one direction. Looking back on the last quarter of a century we gather hope for the next. In another twenty-five years there will be no need to explain the position of women at our universities. There will be nothing left to say then, except that, in very truth, "the woman's cause is man's."

ALICE ZIMMERN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A STUDY OF BEGGARS AND THEIR LODGINGS.

TWENTY-FIVE cents per night may be set as the top limit of the prices of American cheap lodging-houses. There is no bottom limit. In New York a mattress and a blanket may be had for seven cents, a strip of canvas for five cents, a share in a Mulberry Street shed for three cents, and in a stale-beer dive for two cents, and the soft side of a plank at a police station for nothing. In Boston a piece of a floor may be had for nothing, a canvas cot or a settee for five cents, and a bed for seven cents. Fifteen cents is the average price in both cities. Twenty cents insures a more comfortable bed nearer the ground, and twenty-five cents a box-like arrangement open at the top, with just enough space for a single cot.

Whatever other methods of studying cheap lodging-houses may be employed, the advantages of the "laboratory" method are obviously great. Its only disadvantage is the personal discomfort incident to it, for its conscientious application involves becoming a cheap lodger. But, given a moderate love of adventure, adaptability to unusual surroundings and an interest in human nature, this discomfort is not nearly so great as would at first be supposed. A would-be investigator, unless possessed of a mien extraordinarily eloquent of villany or misery, or both, must disguise himself. This I did with all the ingenuity and skill of which I was capable and, resembling in the minutest particulars a professional "bum," I was ready for the business in hand.

At the north end of Boston, on a street of sombre warehouses, is a unique lodging-house, which serves as a beggars' headquarters. Its stone front bears a transparency, lighted at night, with the simple legend, "*Moody's.*" The first floor is occupied by a ship-chandler, and the second by the Moodys. Only the two upper floors are open for lodgers. Tom, the head of the Moody family, seldom shows himself on the upper floors. Mrs. Tom, and Mrs. Tom's daughter, Miss Lizzie, conduct the lodging-house,—it may be as a farmer's "women folks" ofttimes attend to the hen-house,—for what pin-money they can get out of it. Everything is done, to be sure, as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from Tom, and such threats as have to be made are always made in Tom's name, but the only tangible evidence of Tom's existence is his occasional appearance on the stairs at the dinner hour. Mrs. Tom is a fat, fierce, spectacled matron, who, receiving warning of any approach through a glass partition, intercepts all new-comers at the head of the first flight of stairs, and forces them to register and pay in advance for a night, before climbing higher. *Habitués* she knows by sight, and she unbars the door for them, without leaving her cooking or sewing, by pulling a string attached to the latch.

At Moody's, card-room, parlor, smoking-room, reading-room, dining-room and lavatory are one room, called for short "the office." The office is small and has two small-paned windows, whose dinginess gives to the outer world an artistic effect of haze. The floor may have been washed; it has certainly not been painted. The walls and ceiling match it well in color, in spite of clinging traces of whitewash. A stove, gray from old age or overheating, stands in the middle of the room, flanked by a single yellow settee. A broad low shelf that runs clear around the room provides all the other seating capacity needed. It is not much, but it is enough. The guests at Moody's are beggars, not choosers. Here the whole gang holds carnival almost every night through the winter, and here some of its members may be seen at any hour of the day. That the reader may know their quality, let me introduce a few of my friends here.

"Gus" is a gentleman "bum." He is a smooth talker, well informed, who somehow manages to keep himself respectably dressed. In his favorite character of a reduced merchant he could deceive the prince of deceit himself. Urbanity is so natural to Gus that it appears even in his ordinary lodging-house relations—where it is not at all needed. I remember distinctly the beautiful politeness with which he apologized one afternoon, when he woke me from a sound sleep merely to ask me for a match.

"Scotty," red-headed, red-whiskered, canny, has been a "bum" in Scotland, and is well versed in the rites and traditions of the Scottish order. He has seen a good bit of the world, having been, among other things, in the English military service in Africa. He sings rollicking snatches from Burns's "Jolly Beggars," dances the Highland fling divinely, and declaims "Tam o' Shanter" with true Scotch spirit. Scotty is far too versatile an artist to confine himself to any one "dodge," but he is generally soliciting funds to get him back to his wife, dying of consumption in Scotland—not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because this is his cleverest dodge, but because it is the one that pays best.

"Billy" is a religious "bum." The expression of Billy's face is preternaturally solemn; his voice is as though his throat were a tomb, and his skin is a corpse-yellow, his blood being, on his own admission, "all turned to water through the booze." Billy on the mourner's bench is a sight worth going very far to see.

"Saucer," being of English birth, has taken pains to learn the address of nearly every Englishman in Boston and vicinity. In making his appeal, he tells a pitiful story of having been sandbagged and robbed immediately on landing in New York, and curses the day he left England. "Saucer" has been, to a degree, my "pal," and a very good fellow he is. Should I ever be forced to "bum" in earnest, I could ask no truer friend.

"Barney," thanks to a rich Irish brogue, gets money and sympathy in abundance from his transplanted countrymen. Perhaps this is the reason that "Barney" always rallies to the defence of the police when the rest of the gang abuse them.

"Shorty" (six feet two) seems to have been a genuine workingman originally. If his own (unprofessional) story is to be believed, he was kicked out of a job by the "dirty spite" of a petty overseer. Now, nothing could induce him to take up the life of a workingman again. He finds that bumming is easier and pays better, and does not leave a man at the mercy of an unscrupulous overseer's caprice. Professionally "Shorty" is a shoemaker trying to get to a job that has been offered him in a distant town.

"Doc" is a veteran of pure Yankee breed, with a gift of nasal gab which he turns to practical account, occasionally, in selling quack medicines by torchlight, but oftenest in simple, whining begging. He excels in telling stories when among his own, but of their kind the less said here the better. A consummate literary artist was lost in "Doc." Had he not chosen to be a successful tramp, he might as easily have been a successful *littérateur* or comedian. Who dares question his choice?

"Honey," a fat and grizzled negro, born and bred in New York City, "makes a good thing" by claiming to have been a slave "befo' de wah." He boasts at Moody's that he has never done a whole day's work in his life, but such a boast confers no great distinction there.

"Charcoal" is an ex-coal-heaver who keeps himself well grimed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with coal-dust in order to pass for one of the *bona fide* unemployed. As a matter of fact, "Charcoal's" aversion to work is not so strong that he will not do an odd job now and then for the sake of a "booze."

"Bottles," "Charcoal's" "pal," whom no emergency can force to work, is a Bowery boy who has condescended to pass a winter in Boston. He is always in a maudlin condition at the close of the day, and yet always has some money left in his pocket. On the street, he asks for small sums only,—two cents to make up five, or three to make up ten.

"Ratter" begs as a discharged convict. He is such a monster of ugliness to look upon that housewives and servant-girls generally give him what he asks. Ratter's fierceness is all on the surface, however, and he is quite modest in his demands. He has been to "the island," to be sure,—who of the gang has not?—but he is passionately fond of children and would not knowingly hurt a kitten.

"Father" is a patriarchal vagabond very much in his dotage. He seems to have forgotten everything he ever knew except the begging art. He goes out in all weathers, returns at exactly five o'clock and sits in a corner resting his head on his stick without speaking a word. The old fellow is never imposed upon. In fact, the gang seem to hold his venerable stupidity in a kind of awe. Many so-called respectable families treat their aged members less decently.

"The Professor" rivals Gus in gentility, but not in intelligence or apparel. Without being many years older, he is many years farther gone into seediness—of clothes and mind. The Professor was blocked out by nature for a great man. He has a massive, intellectual head, which not even a rusty, broken Derby hat vulgarizes; and the fact that his faded brown overcoat has only a safety-pin for a fastening does not hide his original dignity. His left hand is more like a twisted root than a hand, and for this disfigurement, due to the explosion of a shell at Cold Harbor, he receives a pension.

"Gus" and the "Professor" are a fine pair of decayed Beau Brummels. They are inseparable friends, and such courtliness as they display when they exchange confidences and compliments this generation is rarely privileged to see. One forenoon they solemnly "swore off the drink" together. They had been talking for hours in a serious strain. "Gus" had even recited with genuine feeling several little poems his mother had taught him. They really meant to do better—there is no doubt about it. But unfortunately it was the day for the "Professor's" pension-money, and less than half an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hour after that was received, the swear-off was cancelled by mutual consent; and soon all the pension-money was gone.

Like artists the world over, the "boys" at Moody's luxuriate in shop-talk when they come together at the close of the day. From their talk it appears that they have accurate knowledge not only of charitable organizations and charitable individuals, but of the vulnerable points of both organizations and individuals; also that they take as keen a delight in enlarging upon their methods as artists do in discussing the processes of painting. They exchange spoils as well as notes. Thus "Barney" came in one night fearfully distended, and proceeded to pull from his pockets undervests, drawers, and stockings, which he had no use for himself, but which he had been collecting all the afternoon on the strength of a cunningly devised tale of woe. He sold "Ratter" the stockings for the price of a drink, and took everything else to a pawnshop. Business aside, the range of the conversation at Moody's is considerable. I subjoin a list of the topics of a single day: self-made men, the causes of poverty, the treatment of tramps, Stanley, Livingstone, Chinese Gordon, the Sahara Desert, the war in the Soudan, Blaine, Ben Butler, the Mitchell-Corbett fight, the system of electing aldermen-at-large, the legal aspects of killing in self-defence, the drinking habit, the results of prohibition, and the characters of policemen and rum-sellers. The talk is full of wise sayings, apt characterizations and quaint conceits. They are philosophers, these lodgers, and their philosophy is not to be despised. They literally take life as they find it and question not the mystery of the future. "Don't go a-wranglin' about that," I heard one of them say to two comrades who were disputing about ten cents; "there are plenty of tens in the street." And that settled it. They know how to appreciate the humor of their very hardships, the true mark of the philosopher everywhere. And their philosophy has venerable age to back it. Piers Ploughman set it forth five hundred years ago. This, from the sixteenth century, might be "Shorty's" plea of to-day:

"My name is Nicolas Genings, and I came from Lecester to seeke worke, and I am a hat-maker by my occupation, and all my money is spent, and if I could get money to paye for my lodging this night, I would seeke worke to-morrowe amongst the hatters." [Told by a begging impostor on New Year's Day, 1567.]

"The Beggars' Chorus" might have been sung by Mrs. Tom's patrons, and had they known it they would certainly have adopted it as a statement of their views:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BEGGARS' CHORUS, IN "THE JOVIAL CREW."

(From the Bagford Collection of Ballads, 1660.)

A bag for my wheat,
Another for my rye,
A little bottle by my side,
To drink when I'm a-dry:
And a-begging we will go, we'll go, we'll go,
And a-begging we will go.

To Pimlico we'll go,
Where merry we shall be,
With ev'ry Man, a Can in's Hand,
And a Wench upon his knee.
And a-begging we will go, we'll go, we'll go,
And a-begging we will go.

Seven years I served
My old Master Wild,
Seven years I begged,
Whilst I was but a child.
And a-begging we will go, we'll go, we'll go,
And a-begging we will go.

I begged for my Master
And got him store of Pelf,
But Jove now be praised,
I now beg for myself.
And a-begging we will go, we'll go, we'll go,
And a-begging we will go.

Of all occupations,
A beggar lives the best,
For when he is a-weary,
He'll lie him down and rest.
And a-begging we will go, we'll go, we'll go,
And a-begging we will go.

I fear no plots against me,
But live in open cell;
Why, who would be a King,
When a beggar lives so well?
And a-begging we will go, we'll go, we'll go,
And a-begging we will go.

Whether the gang at Moody's know it or not, they belong to a mystic order with an enormous background of history. I have yet to discover a single trick that was not practised before this century. Indeed, the great original geniuses of the order seem to have lived centuries ago. For generations its members have contributed nothing to the common stock; on the contrary, they have been living as much upon the wits of their forebears as upon the labor of the com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munity. The *habitués* of Moody's and similar lodging-houses have real cause to blush for the shameful degeneracy of their wits.

My bed at Moody's cost me fifteen cents a night. It was one of a score or more of cots in a large room under the roof. Though no pretence was made to keep it clean, the mattresses were fairly soft and there were quilts enough for the coldest weather. Ventilation there was absolutely none. Nevertheless there are worse places in Boston than Moody's.

Mission lodging-houses, of which there are a number in Boston, are a distinct class. They have less human interest than the lodging-houses without the religious taint, and are, in spite of square yards of printed rules and painted texts, quite as demoralizing. In them, dexterity with pious cant is at a high premium, inasmuch as religious experience is made the main test of desert. The best-known mission-lodging in Boston is reported to have ejected a steady man because he refused to "testify." On the other hand, it allows the man who gets himself "gloriously saved" to keep bed and board indefinitely. The "mission bum" is the worst "bum" known. Any member of the "hobo" fraternity may be forced to simulate repentance and conversion now and then—all trades have their periods of depression—but the man who, of choice, does this habitually is regarded by his own ilk as the most despicable of mortals. For more reasons than I can name here, I am bound to respect the scruples of a "bum" who refuses to be sent to a mission lodging-house.

It may be hard to get a cheap bed even when you have the money to pay for it. So I found it one bitter cold night when I had fifteen cents in my pocket. Riley's, Williams's, and Whitney's were all full, and that is how I came to go to Brewster's mission. The mission-hall was low and ill-lighted. Scripture texts adorned the walls. Prayer was being offered as I entered, and I was surprised beyond measure at the devotional spirit displayed by the audience. Nearly every head was bowed. The secret of the reverential attitude came out at the end of the petition, inasmuch as the heads continued bowed. What had looked like devotion was really drowsiness. Between prayers, a floor-walker did his best to wake up the men. The platform part of this meeting was of the conventional city-mission type, but the listeners were strangely unresponsive. Not a person asked for prayers, not one was roused to raise his hand to signify he wanted "salvation," and the meeting closed gloomily enough with prophecies from the desk of dire damnations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There are only a few beds at Brewster's. A part of these are rented at fifteen cents a night to such as are able to pay; the remainder are assigned to workers in the wood-yard. In cold weather the mission-room is used as a dormitory. Being present at a meeting entitles a man to a settee and a blanket afterward, provided settees and blankets hold out. When they do not, there is still the floor. No one is turned away. I was one of the few who had to be satisfied with the floor. Although the stove heated the air for only a few feet around itself, the majority stripped to the skin before wrapping themselves in the dirty blankets. I had only my arm for a pillow, the floor was so hard it made my bones ache, and so icy I shivered with all my clothes on. For these reasons, as well as because loud coughing and sneezing were incessant, I could not sleep more than a few minutes at a time, and I should have been very miserable had I not been within easy hearing of the entertaining gossip of the watchmen. These watchmen had given glorious "testimonies" from the platform during the meeting. It was morbidly interesting to find them adepts in obscenity and vulgarity now that the superintendent (their employer) was gone and the lights were turned down.

In New York, the municipality does nothing for homeless men except to offer them the police-stations. The same was true of Boston up to 1879, when the "Wayfarers' Lodge," better known as the "Hawkins Street Woodyard," was established to provide lodging for the destitute in return for work. I entered the office of the "Lodge" after a hard, slippery tramp of more than a mile through a storm of alternate sleet and rain. As homeless men do not carry umbrellas, I was drenched to the skin. Yet I was quickly shoved into line to wait my turn with the night-clerk who was registering applicants. "What's your name? How old are you? Where were your born? Next!" was the form with each applicant. When my turn for answering came, I involuntarily leaned over the rail just a trifle in order to make myself heard. "Here, you bum, you, what do you think you're doing here? Get off that rail and stand up straight! Lively!" was bawled at me from behind the desk. It was a bit of blackguardism that almost threw me off my guard. An indignant reply rose to my lips, but, remembering my mission there, I held my tongue in submission, as every poor devil who comes here is forced to do, and was rewarded for my self-restraint with a red card bearing a number—my mark of identity for the remainder of my sojourn.

In the basement hallway, where I was sent from the office, a tall,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saturnine functionary was crying with the voice of a street-hawker: "Take your hat and shoes to bed. Leave nothing in your shoes. Leave your underclothes loose. Tie your other clothes together in a bundle. Wear your check around your neck." As soon as I had stripped and bundled my outer clothes I passed through a doorway, where I received a metal check in return for my red card and was relieved of all my possessions except my shoes and hat. Then came the compulsory bath, so very disagreeable an affair that the repugnance of the begging fraternity to it may charitably be attributed to something else than laziness and incorrigible love of dirt. The floor of the bath-room was sloppy and cold to bare feet. If the tubs themselves were really clean, they certainly did not look so. Soap was convenient for the bathers, if its use was not much enforced. I am not prepared to swear that successive squads of bathers used the same water. I certainly did not see the water changed while I remained in the bath-room. One of the employees, to be sure, was posed with a scrubbing-brush in a threatening attitude, but I did not see him use the brush. The towel, which hung over the lower end of my tub, was perfectly clean, but the rack on which I was made to stand while wiping was cold, wet, and dirty. As I left, a coarse, dingy-colored, but clean night-shirt was given to me, and I was directed to my room up two flights of stairs.

My bed was one of a number of cots in a clean, steam-heated, ventilated room, without a trace of the familiar lodging-house odor, and so, in spite of the humiliating experiences with the night-clerk and the bath-tub, I was well content to crawl between the blankets with my metal check about my neck. The novelty of being checked for dreamland, as a trunk is checked for a journey, was, it is true, a little disturbing, but talking aloud was strictly forbidden, and the stillness was highly conducive to sleep.

We were rapped up before light, and within two minutes the dormitory was emptied. Once again in the basement hallway, we waited for our numbers to be called in a perilous cold draught,—a quite unnecessary hardship, as we might as easily have been sent from the sleeping-room in small squads. The dressing was done amid much confusion, for the hallway was overcrowded and we were in no very good humor over our treatment. My underclothes were still clammy from the steam-cleansing to which they had been subjected during the night, and my outer clothes were nearly as wet as when they were tied up. It was as dangerous as it was unpleasant to get into them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When I was dressed, an axe was given to me and I set at work in the yard. The breakfast, to which I was allowed to go after two hours of wood-splitting and -piling, was served at a well-scrubbed counter in a cheerless room. It consisted of hard ship-biscuit, an enormous bowl of soup, and several "hunks" of bread. The soup was ridiculously thin, and so peppery that it nearly blistered my tongue. It did not satisfy hunger and did create a raging thirst for drink,—a sorry turn to serve easily tempted men. No one of my companions ate more than a third of what was in his bowl. The instant I stopped eating, I was gruffly ordered off the premises, and, all things considered, I was not loath to go.

The cheap lodging-house is not an accident in city life. 1. In the first place, it is the poor man's hotel. A poor man must sometimes travel, and when he does travel he patronizes such hotels as he can afford. He cannot pay a dollar a night for a room, and if he could he would not feel at home in it. 2. It satisfies the social instinct. A permanent private lodging with more physical comforts can be had for about the same money, but the public lodging is more sociable. The latter has all the salient attractions of the country corner grocery and the city club. 3. It admits of rare freedom of movement. Bad habits render the tenure of private lodgings insecure, and, in any event, there are chafing restraints about private houses. The freedom Charles Lamb predicates of the beggar is that also of the lodging-house *habitué:*

> "He is the only man in the universe who is not obliged to study appearances The price of stock or land affecteth him not. The fluctuations of agricultural or commercial prosperity touch him not, or, at worst, but change his customers. He is not expected to become bail or surety for any one. No man troubleth him with questioning his religion or politics. He is the only free man in the universe."

4. It favors the lazy carelessness that regards all forethought as waste thought, and that makes it a rule to follow the line of least resistance, wherever it may lead. Regular weekly or monthly payments of rent must be wearily planned for; daily payments cast no shadows before. 5. It satisfies the gaming instinct. Every day is an uncertainty; every day is a lottery-drawing. The prize—a bed, a meal, a drink, a smoke, and fireside gossip; the blank—none of these luxuries.

"Rounders" or "regulars" display many interesting human qualities. There is real *esprit de corps* among them. The social obliga-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion is heartily accepted. "Bearing one another's burdens" means more to the average rounder than to the average church member. "You wouldn't pick a man up and give him a drink if you found him layin' pegged out in the street. No, you wouldn't, not even if you had had a good day,"—I heard one lodger say to another in a white heat of anger. Not to share one's luck with one's pals is the one unpardonable sin. For all that, there are hard-and-fast class distinctions. The man who pays twenty cents for a bed lets no chance slip to display his superiority over the fifteen-cent lodger.

That the cheap lodging-houses are a menace to the physical, moral, and political health of the community, there can be no doubt. In the winter of 1892–93 typhus fever broke out in a lodging-house on Bayard Street, New York, and, despite all efforts to check it, gained a foothold rapidly in the "hotels" along the Bowery, finally infecting the wretched police lodging-rooms.

That the city escaped a deadly epidemic was due only to the exceptional vigilance of the health officers and the sanitary police. The danger threatened Boston, too, on account of the constant flitting about of the vagrant class that patronize these houses. Energetic measures were taken to avert it. Mr. Damrell, inspector of buildings in Boston, reported: that the "sanitary condition of the lodging-houses should be made better than at present; the quantity of air to each individual is very small and the danger of fire very great." My own painful experiences corroborate fully the expert testimony. The houses are filthy as a rule, with no ventilation of any kind, even though fifty men may be sleeping in one room. To say that the atmosphere of such a room is "heavy" in the morning is to put it mildly. Only at the Wayfarers' Lodge did I find a window left open at night. Often when the covering has been insufficient, I have shivered with cold, unable to sleep for the racking cough of my consumptive comrades. Many of the buildings are old wooden affairs, insufficiently provided with exits and fire-escapes. The danger of fire is enormously increased by the lodgers' habit of smoking in bed, by their frequent drunkenness and by the use of oil-lamps.

The extent to which the lodging-houses cause intemperance may easily be exaggerated. Drunkenness, to be sure, is the very best of "form" in these places, and to this tempting rule of etiquette every one is likely sooner or later to defer. The lodging-house is the worst possible place in which to attempt to live up to a "swear-off," and it may be that it causes an occasional young fellow from the country to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stumble; but the majority drink, I feel sure, from the force of a habit for which the lodging-houses are scarcely responsible. They encourage intemperance—it is not fair to say more than that.

In New York, saloon and lodging-house are apt to be under one roof and control,—a profitable arrangement, no doubt; and in the back room of certain saloons, particularly in the latitude of Chatham Square, steady customers are allowed to take a sit-up nap for the price of a drink. The abomination of the stale-beer dives is the next and last step toward the gutter, if in fact it is not a long way beyond it. That these, and the "barrel-houses" of New York, seem to have no counterpart in Boston makes nothing for the virtuous reputation of that city. It means only that the immoralities of the lodging-house class are not carried on in the lodgings themselves.

The testimony as to the relation of the lodging-houses to sexual immorality varies greatly. The moral enormities of the stale-beer dives in New York have often been described. The chief of police of New Orleans testifies: "The very worst kind of liquors are sold to both males and females, and under its influence the wildest orgies are perpetrated, with great sexual immorality." The police authorities of Detroit, St. Louis, San Francisco, Cleveland, and Washington report that sexual immorality is more or less increased by the existence of the cheap, transient lodging-houses, while those of Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Boston, and Cincinnati hold that it is not. Sailors' lodging-houses are a class by themselves. They have been much improved, but are yet very far from immaculate.

As regards crime, the case against the lodging-houses is very strong. Reports from the chief police officials of New York, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, New Orleans, Detroit, Cleveland, and St. Louis unite in condemning the cheap lodging-houses as nurseries of crime, where the innocent are brought in contact with criminals, with the usual results of familiar contact. By way of contrast the superintendent of police of Philadelphia describes those of his bailiwick as "patronized by the working class who have no home, and who are compelled to seek shelter in keeping with their allowance." Those who should know agree in the main with the pessimistic view of the police.

It is at election times, when votes have a cash value, that the lodging-houses in New York come out strong. Neither their patrons nor their owners have any moral scruples about bribery that are not easily overcome, and the work of colonization is a regular autumnal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feature of these establishments. "It is usually done," says Inspector Byrnes, "in the interest of some local political boss who stands by the owner of the house in case the latter gets into trouble." I have no evidence that things are quite so bad in Boston. Still I do know that election day means far more to lodgers than Christmas, for I have heard them on election morning sagely and fondly forecast the voting market, and at the end of the day exultingly compare ballot prices, and I have shared in the festivities that came from the spending of the bribes.

The testimony of the police that the lodging-houses are the rendezvous and recruiting ground for tramps and beggars is perhaps the most ominous of all. How large a proportion of their patrons would accept work if it were offered, and stick to it, I can only guess. There are no statistics on the subject and never will be, probably, until a public work test can be universally and continuously applied. My guess is that the proportion is very small. I found the "bums" numerous in most houses and decidedly in the majority in some. Again, how many of these were to the manner born I cannot say. It is the easiest thing in the world for a discouraged "out-of-work" to become a street beggar. Once the barrier of pride is down, it is far simpler and only a trifle more humiliating to beg than to hunt for work. Besides, begging in hard times is exceptionally profitable. Last winter was a glorious one for the city "bum." He could easily have saved money, had it not been against his principles to do so. "It may be bad for the rest, but it is a good year for us," was the way one of my friends put it. "A 'cop' da'sn't bag a tramp now ther' ain't no work. People ain't goin' to let him." And he was right. In such a season the tramp has logically the best of it.

The solution of the lodging-house problem, if there is a solution, may be in getting at the unemployed. There is certainly nothing to be gained by blotting out the lodging-houses, and not so much as is often supposed by the substitution of so-called model establishments. Of course, no lodging-house should be allowed to do business without a license. With only licensed places to deal with, the public can be adequately protected against physical contagion by the exercise to the full of the powers vested in the Health Boards. Serious danger from fire can be averted by an extension of the authority of the Building Inspector. Putting the houses under the strictest police surveillance ought to practically end immorality and crime in them, and real ballot reform the buying and selling of votes. But, with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all these things done, the lodging-houses would still be social plague-spots, for they would still be the headquarters of begging loafers. If society has moral enthusiasm and energy and persistence enough, in dealing with its unfortunates, to separate the sheep from the goats—to make it possible for every man who wishes to work to work without a stigma, and to force every man who can work, and will not, to work under a stigma, in a place of permanent detention, cut off from the possibility of propagating his disgraceful kind,—then the lodging-house problem is solved. With idleness and the excuse for idleness taken out of them, the lodging-houses would grow naturally into real model lodging-houses, invaluable nuclei for movements of social betterment and powers for great good instead of great evil in the community.

ALVAN F. SANBORN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DOOM OF THE SMALL TOWN.

GROWTH and prosperity, in a country which has not yet attained its full development, are practically identical. To lose population, to decline in trade, in industry, in wealth, in public spirit—these are the signs of decay. France is the one nation of Christendom which makes progress in art, industry, and commerce while stationary in population. In the United States, on account of the restless activity of the people and their easy transition from place to place and from one vocation to another, the locality which loses its inhabitants loses also its energies and sinks into lethargy. The decline of large cities, whenever it has occurred, has attracted universal attention, but less heed is paid to the decay of villages. One by one, family by family, their inhabitants slip away in search of other homes; a steady but hardly perceptible emigration takes away the young, the hopeful, the ambitious. There remain behind the superannuated, the feeble, the dull, the stagnant rich who will risk nothing, the ne'er-do-wells who have nothing to risk. Enough workers remain to till the soil, to manage the distribution of food and clothing, and to transact the common business of life; but the world's real work is done elsewhere.

Such a silent tragedy is enacted to-day in a multitude of small communities scattered throughout the North-Central States. All these small communities had their period of active growth; many of them, indeed, grew too fast, some dried up and perished. Their people look back sorrowfully to the time when the railroads were built, when the mills were grinding, when town property was worth more than it cost. That happy period was from ten to thirty years ago: the general decline of the small municipalities of the West became most noticeable during the decade from 1880 to 1890. The facts that had been obvious to every one familiar with this region were then tabulated in the census reports.

The States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa may be selected as representing the richest and best-watered region in the United States. Area for area, they probably surpass any other part of the United States in varied general productiveness. In the breeding of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

horses Illinois is first among the States of the Union, and Iowa second; in number of cattle, Iowa is second, and Illinois is third (the first being Texas); in the value of live-stock, Iowa is first, Illinois is second; in the number of swine, Iowa is first, Illinois is second; in the production of corn, Iowa is first, Illinois is second; in the production of wheat, Illinois is second, Indiana is third, Ohio is fourth. These States are served by many railroads: indeed, Illinois had the greatest railroad mileage of all the States in the census year, and Kansas the next greatest; Iowa came third, though these relations have since changed. Indeed, it may be asked whether these States have not an embarrassment of this kind of riches when it is considered that Iowa, with less than two millions of people, has more miles of railroad than New York, with six millions. These States, moreover, lie in the very heart of the continent, and directly in the path of inter-oceanic travel and commerce. Their citizens are intelligent, education is universal, and the climate is neither too hot nor too cold.

Yet in these rich States, empires in themselves, and in the finest counties of each, forces are at work to check the growth and stifle the vitality of nearly half their townships. The following table, prepared from the census returns, shows the number of townships in each of these States which, during the decade from 1880 to 1890, made some gain in population, how many stood still, and how many lost:

States.	Townships stationary in population, 1880–1890.	Townships gained population.	Townships lost population.	Total townships.
Ohio	32	529	755	1,316
Indiana	16	496	482	994
Illinois	45	579	800	1,424
Iowa	29	893	691	1,613
Michigan	22	506	416	944
Totals	144	3,003	3,144	6,291

Cook County, Illinois, is not included; neither are other counties whose township boundaries have been changed so as to preclude comparisons; but these would not relatively change the table.

A map of these States, showing the counties darkened in which the greatest depopulation has occurred, would be blackest in the eastern half of Iowa, in all the northern and western parts of Illinois, in northern, southeastern and central Indiana; and southern Michigan, and the southern half of Ohio would be very black indeed. Many counties show an aggregate gain, although nearly every township in these counties, except those containing the chief towns, sus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tained a loss. In some cases, though a majority of the townships show a slight increase, the falling off in others has been so large as to throw the whole county into the retrograde column. This shrinkage is seen in sharp contrast when it is remembered that during the same period every one of these States gained during this decade very largely in population, the increase in Ohio being 474,000, or nearly 15 per cent; in Indiana, 214,000, or 10.8 per cent; in Illinois, 748,000, or 24.3 per cent; in Iowa, 287,000, or 17.6 per cent.

In Michigan, the population of at least half the townships in every county in the four southern tiers, excepting Allegan, is either stationary or declining rapidly; and many of those counties do not contain more than three or four townships that have increased their population by a single soul in ten years. This broad belt of excellent fruit and farming land, with the northern tier in Indiana, which is in the same course of gradual depopulation, is "gridironed" with trunk-line railroads. A similar area stretches between Chicago and Cincinnati, and between Chicago and St. Louis. Indeed of Illinois it may be said that the entire State, north and west of a line from Chicago to St. Louis, is undergoing a rapid transformation; for its rural population is drawn into the larger cities and to other States, and its business industries are moving away or declining. Five great railroads cross Iowa from west to east, all passing through northern Illinois to Chicago. At least half the townships in almost every county in the eastern half of Iowa, and in many counties almost all the townships, show a decided loss of population.

Many of the older States of the East and South show the same tendencies, probably in less degree; but these North-Central States, by reason of their natural advantages, offer a more striking illustration of the remarkable influences now at work. The rich strip of counties in Iowa, lying along the Mississippi, show utter stagnation during the last decade, 1880 to 1890. These counties have each from fifteen to twenty townships; and each contains one or more towns of sufficient size to have been the beneficiary of the shifting of population. Beginning at the northern boundary of the State, the number of townships in each county that have positively declined during a period of general improvement throughout the country is one hundred and thirty-four.[1] On the other side of the river, in Illinois,

[1] Allamakee County, 16 townships have lost population; Clayton, 12; Dubuque, 15; Jackson, 16; Clinton, 15; Scott, 14; Muscatine, 11; Louisa, 12; Des Moines, 9; Lee, 14.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in one hundred and seventy-four townships stretching in an unbroken line along the river from Wisconsin to St. Louis, the same state of things exists.[1] The great waterway from north to south has not in the least checked the tendency to depopulation. East and west, along the great railroad lines, the decline is equally manifest. The counties along the line of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad from Des Moines to Chicago show two hundred and six retrograde townships;[2] and on east from Chicago to Detroit, along the Michigan Central, one hundred and twenty-five townships are in a like condition.[3] On these two lines of railroad, therefore, stretching from Des Moines to Detroit, a distance of more than five hundred miles, all the small communities, excepting those immediately adjacent to Chicago, have steadily declined in population. Many which are classed as "increasing" show a growth of from only ten to fifty persons in ten years, which, in view of the rapid growth of the cities, might fairly be deemed decline.

For five hundred miles, then, in a straight line through four States, some evil influence is at work to arrest the growth and destroy the prosperity of all the groups of population which are too small to resist it. They are all served by one railroad, which is abundantly sufficient for their needs, but few of them enjoy the benefits of competition. Separately, they are too insignificant to have any voice in determining the amount of their taxation in the shape of transportation charges. Thus, year after year they have seen their hopes deferred, their business dwindle, their young industries starved out, their most enterprising citizens depart, until dilapidation seems their natural condition, and public spirit dies away. It is not surprising to find that when the people move away they close up their shops and mills; or probably it would be more accurate to say that, being compelled to abandon their means of livelihood, they went elsewhere in search of that employment which their own communities denied them.

The chief productive industries in small Western communities have been the manufacture of agricultural implements, of brick and tile,

[1] Jo Daviess County, 17 townships have lost population; Carroll, 11; Whiteside, 17; Henry, 22; Rock Island, 15; Mercer, 11; Hancock, 21; Adams, 20; Pike, 17; Calhoun, 2; Jersey, 8; Madison, 13.

[2] Polk County, 14 townships; Jasper, 14; Poweshiek, 13; Iowa, 15; Johnson, 19; Muscatine, 11; Scott, 14; Rock Island, 15; Henry, 22; Bureau, 22; La Salle, 23; DeKalb, 11; Kendall, 8; Kane, 3; Dupage, 2.

[3] Lake, 4; Porter, 6; Laporte, 9; Berrien, 8; Cass, 12; St. Joseph, 13; Branch, 14; Calhoun, 16; Jackson, 16; Washtenaw, 18; Wayne, 9.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cooperage, grist mills and flouring mills, foundries and machine shops, saw-mills and mills whose products are made from logs and bolts, the making of furniture, wagons, and carriages. Twenty years ago all these trades flourished in almost every village of a thousand or more people. I have been familiar from childhood with one such town where the following branches of manufacture were once in active and profitable operation: 4 flouring and grist mills, 3 saw-mills, 5 wagon and carriage shops, 3 woollen mills, 3 furniture and cabinet shops, 1 foundry and machine shop, 2 cooper shops, besides many smaller industries. All the flour mills are silent to-day, though two new ones have sprung up in their places, operated by steam instead of water-power; all the saw-mills are gone; all the wagon and carriage shops are deserted or at best do a little repairing; two of the woollen mills belong to the past and the remaining one does a small business; and cabinet-making is hardly any more a recognized trade. One by one these little centres of industrial activity succumbed to the inevitable: every one of them tells a sad story of heroic struggle with conditions which they but dimly understood and were powerless to resist. Yet this region is a portion of the State of Iowa where crops never fail and where nature has done everything to encourage a prosperous population. How extensive and all-pervasive have been the influences which combined to smother the dawning life of the small towns and villages throughout this North-Central portion of our country is shown by the following condensation of the census reports in those branches of industry that I have named in the four States of Michigan, Indiana, Illinois and Iowa:

DECLINE OF VILLAGE INDUSTRIES.

		Agricultural implements.	Brick and tile.	Cooperage.	Flour and grist mills.	Foundries and machine shops.	Saw mills.	Furniture and cabinet-making.
Iowa. . . .	1880	58	280	112	713	102	328	175
	1890	34	260	91	441	136	137	82
Illinois. .	1880	220	616	(a)	1024	299	640	373
	1890	100	604	(a)	647	408	357	356
Indiana.	1880	96	735	265	996	120	2,022	272
	1890	54	764	170	723	206	1,603	196
Michigan	1880	143	179	265	706	220	1,649	210
	1890	65	185	181	544	260	1,918	223

(a) Figures not accessible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet in each of these States the total number of "plants" has considerably increased, and a large increase in the number of their employees is shown. It is evident, therefore, that there has been a rapid concentration in larger shops and mills, coincident with an expansion of the volume of work. There has been a struggle between the municipalities of the country, in which every town and city is doing its best to stifle its smaller neighbors on the one hand, and on the other hand to maintain itself against greater competitors. In this warfare, the smaller the town the more it suffers. Especially when the prodigious influence of the railroad system is exerted to help the great cities in the work of destruction, the plight of the little places is hard indeed. As between two equal competing towns, the one that is favored even slightly by railroad rates will win; as between a terminal city, enjoying cheap competitive rates, and a village doomed to suffer such charges as the railroad managers see fit to impose, there is no prospect for the latter but gradual extinction.

The interstate commerce law, and the commission created thereby, appear to take it for granted that towns having two railroads have certain rights that those having only one road have not. No discrimination between individuals at the same point is legal. Yet although the railroads are coming to be regarded more and more as constituting a single organic system, which ought to bear with equal and uniform pressure upon all and to diffuse its benefits equally, it seems to be quite generally agreed that charges shall be least to the great cities, because they are great, and highest to the little villages, because they are small and helpless. Even the law which is designed to correct these irregularities so far as they occur on any given line of railroad, by prohibiting the charging of a greater sum for a shorter haul than for a longer over the same line and going in the same direction—the so-called long-and-short-haul clause of the commerce law—has in practice been much ignored by the railroads; and the complexity of the railroad system makes its enforcement a matter of extreme difficulty.

It must be admitted that the question how fairly to regulate the charges on staple products, which are shipped in train or car-loads to distant markets, is one of the greatest difficulty. Large areas in the West have increased in wealth almost solely because minimum through-rates have practically brought them nearer to the seaboard than the farms of western New York are. When the agriculture of the North-Atlantic States came into competition with the new cheap

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lands of the West through the general practice of hauling a thousand miles for a small fraction of the proportionate charge for a hundred miles, and in many cases for a smaller actual charge, there was an instant and rapid sinking of value in the East. During the decade of the seventies, the North-Atlantic group of States lost in the value of their farming lands, $263,000,000, and during the eighties, $356,000,000. This great depreciation, however, was due as much to the superior productiveness of Western lands as to the advantage they had in the matter of rates. But in the case of the North-Central group of States, whose vicissitudes we are now studying, they have no competitor in the quality or the productiveness of the soil; and accordingly, no diminution of farm values has occurred, but on the contrary there has been a constant and steady appreciation. The census of 1890 shows a gain of $119,000,000 in the value of farm lands in Indiana, $253,000,000 in Illinois, $290,000,000 in Iowa; and in all the North-Central group, $1,940,000,000. Superintendent Porter, of the Eleventh Census, attributes the damage sustained by the rural population of these States to the destructive effect of agricultural competition with the States farther West. This can be true only in part, and in so far as the far Western States have unfair advantage in the railroad charges. The drought-stricken regions of Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas can never compete with Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio strictly on their own merits. Relative situations have changed, and the same discrimination which formerly worked so potently in the development of these States and so destructively to the agriculture of the East, is now building up the newer States at the expense of the North-Central States, impelling emigration to the West and Northwest; and at the same time the ever-present forces of centralization are drawing the rural and village population into the larger centres. In this double movement of wealth and population, the unregulated power of railroad managers to fix rates is a most important factor.

But whatever be the causes, unless present tendencies be arrested, the future of the small towns is extremely discouraging; and it is very doubtful whether any material change in existing conditions will soon occur. The superior economies of the factory system of manufacture will doubtless continue to operate unfavorably to small industries. One of these economies is the cheap rates of transportation given to large producers and to great competitive centres; and, until the unification of the railroad system is carried to its logical comple-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and in some way, either by the elimination of competition between the different parts of the system through government regulation, by the legalization and perfection of pooling, or otherwise, freight rates are made substantially fair and uniform throughout the country, no great improvement in the condition of Western rural communities can be expected. The grand march of improvement which is creating many splendid cities will go on unchecked, but for these the villages will be only feeders.

These tendencies have long been noticed; indeed, it would have been impossible to travel extensively throughout the West and Northwest without being struck on every hand by the evidences of arrested development in nearly every hamlet. Mr. A. B. Stickney, in his book "The Railway Problem," says:

> "When a village has a few stores, a blacksmith, a shoemaker, and a carpenter, the wants of the adjacent territory are supplied. To increase beyond this point requires the introduction of manufactories and the larger class of tradesmen or jobbers. Every village in a new country has expectations. On these are based the value of its town lots, and the wealth, or expected wealth, of the villagers. It is true that with the fairest and most equitable railway tariff a majority of these expectations would come to naught; but with a discrimination of ten to fifteen cents per hundredweight against them there is no hope. At the time under consideration, the villagers had begun to realize the hopelessness of their situation. All their brightest business men were moving to the cities, and the few manufacturing establishments that had started in a small way had either moved or foresaw that unless a speedy change came they must move."

The period Mr. Stickney refers to is the early years of the railroad development in the Northwest; but the fact that all the conditions he mentions were still in full tide during the last decade argues the continuance of similar causes. It is not believed that any check in these tendencies was noticeable prior to the panic of 1893.

There are compensations even for the protracted stagnation which has been described. Each of these little places has been a veritable haven in the midst of the financial storm which, for the last two years, has swept the cities. In seas where no ships sail no wrecks are seen. Where there are few wage-earners, no corporation bubbles, no fever of speculation, no overbuilding, no inflation of values, there is little to fear from panics. A panic is a day of judgment for all commercial iniquity, and for all financial folly as well; and the hamlet has no great sins to answer for. Throughout at least a large portion of this region the effects of the intense depression have been but little felt in the small places, and when felt at all they have been felt indirectly. The banks were full of money, and their only losses

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were incurred by carrying the paper of the banks, trust companies, building and loan associations, debenture-bond companies, and the thousand and one rotten institutions with which the cities have been infested. The markets being flooded with unsalable goods of every description, the hard cash of the thrifty farmer and the frugal villager felt a relative appreciation, and came cautiously forth in search of bargains. This condition will doubtless last until a general revival of business, when the current toward the city will again set in. But just at present, many an idle mechanic and many a stranded adventurer in the cities sighs regretfully as he thinks of some country village left behind him, and with the Hoosier poet longs to go—

" . . . back to Griggsby's Station—
Back where we ust to be so happy and so pore."

One of the serious consequences of the drawing away of the youth and energy of the villages and towns is found in the benumbing effect it has upon those who remain behind. There is little incentive to start new enterprises, and especially is there small encouragement for boys to learn skilled trades. Hence the prospect before the boys of these villagers is depressing in the extreme. There is practically no chance for a boy to become skilled in any trade except in the building trades, the blacksmith shops, and in the commonest handicrafts. The late awakening to the value of manual-training schools is confined almost exclusively to the largest cities. Nothing is done in the smaller towns to teach manual skill or general expertness in the use of tools, and the idea of any public effort to encourage the education of highly skilled mechanics in any department is not even thought of. A boy may learn to hold a plough, to shovel dirt, to do common carpenters' work, to paint a house, to shoe a horse; he may learn how to clerk in a store, to become a lawyer, or to sell life-insurance; but the country towns are absolutely dead to the need of cultivating the mechanic arts, and teaching the American youth that general knowledge and special skill without which our native workers are being so rapidly driven out of the higher branches of industrial activity. In Switzerland, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Austria, the village boy or girl with any aptitude finds a school near by in which he may pursue the lines of study proper to lay the foundation for any art or calling, and in most cases he may then enter a trade-school from which, after years of the most thorough practical and technical instruction, he may be graduated a finished master of his chosen trade.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is to become of the American rural and village population, which is shut out from even the benefits of such manual training as may now be had in the high schools of a few of the most progressive cities? We are fast creating a peasantry, which, in another generation, will seem rude in comparison with the peasantry of Europe, unless we adopt some enlightened method of enabling our workers to compete, man for man, with the artisans of Europe. Prices artificially increased by law may tempt the foreign worker to remove to this country, but a truer protection would seek to make our own mechanic a better man. Practically the Western village boy can neither learn a skilled trade at home nor practise it there; to rise in life, to give scope to his ambition, he must become an exile from his native town.

Much is being said about discontent in the West, and about the growth of sectionalism along new lines. Some deny that there is any such unrest, and they point to the general prosperity of the thriving cities in proof of the statement that the people are in general prosperous. The extreme depression of agriculture cannot be traced to railroad discrimination or to any single cause, but that there is dissatisfaction with such abnormal conditions as exist throughout the North-Central States is certain; and it is not strange that the people become impatient with evils which seem wholly unnecessary. Whatever be the causes of the paralysis with which these communities are stricken, they affect all classes, whether farmers or villagers, but apparently the little industries of the towns suffer most. The people, therefore, in their efforts to understand the real source of the oppression which they realize keenly, but which is so pervasive as to seem almost to belong to the nature of things, rush from one political party to another in search of relief; they embrace in turn all possible vagaries with enthusiasm. This is why Populism, which never has had much strength in the cities, is most active in the country villages. The need of some kind of relief is plain enough.

HENRY J. FLETCHER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STUDIES OF NOTABLE MEN: LORD ROSEBERY.

LORD ROSEBERY seems to me by far the most interesting figure in the living politics of England just now. He is so very interesting because he is still somewhat of a puzzle to most of us. Men who have come much more lately than he into the field of politics here have already given their measure. We know what we may fairly expect from them. Take for example the present Home Secretary, Mr. Asquith. Mr. Asquith won a sudden and great success. He is one of the foremost debaters in the House of Commons. Name the best six men we have, and, choose them how you will, you must put Mr. Asquith among them. But it is not to undervalue Mr. Asquith if we say that we know what he can do. Lord Rosebery has not yet shown all that he can do. He has a great game to play—most of us feel ready to put our money on his winning it; but he has not won it as yet: not so, even though he is Prime Minister. This in itself is a high tribute to Lord Rosebery: for see what he has done. He has twice been Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and achieved a complete success in that most difficult and delicate business, the conduct of foreign policy—a success acknowledged by political enemy as cordially as by personal friend. He is now Prime Minister—in succession to Mr. Gladstone. He is one of the best speakers that the two Houses of Parliament can put forward. He is powerful and persuasive as a platform orator: his after-dinner speeches are triumphs of easy brilliancy. What can we expect him to do more? What can any one expect him to do more?

Yet the answer would be given in much the same words by everybody here who is interested in the question: we do expect Lord Rosebery to do more; we want more from him; we do not believe that he has yet given us the best he has to give; we shall be disappointed if even this that he has achieved is all he is to achieve.

His very appearance is for him in one sense and against him in another. Lord Rosebery is a young statesman, as the age of statesmen is reckoned in England. We regard a man anywhere under fifty in political life as quite young. People kept on talking of Lord

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hartington, now the Duke of Devonshire, as a young statesman even after he had passed that respectable age. Lord Rosebery is forty-seven; but he looks ever so many years younger. He has a singularly boyish face. The very gravity of the face, when it is grave, is like the occasional and portentous gravity of an Eton schoolboy. When the face brightens into mirth, as it very often does, the mirth is the roguish merriment of a schoolboy. This is one of the reasons why solemn and staid persons are especially puzzled about Lord Rosebery. He cannot be in earnest, such people often say. Look at his face! He has not a serious thought in him for more than five minutes together.

Lord Rosebery was educated at Eton, and at Christ Church, Oxford. If I had to choose two places of education from those I know in the world I should choose for picturesqueness and for associations Eton public school to begin with and the University of Oxford to follow. Lord Rosebery became a peer on the death of his grandfather in 1868 and never sat in the House of Commons. He himself has more than once deplored the fact that he never had an opportunity of taking part in the splendid struggles of the representative chamber. He has described the House of Lords as a chamber the doors of which unfortunately only open inwards. To a young man of such versatility, energy, growing eloquence, and potential statesmanship, the House of Lords is a place to chill ardor and to numb exertion. The peers do indeed have what is called a full-dress debate every now and then in the course of a session; but unless it is a question whether some measure sent up by the House of Commons is or is not to be rejected, there is no particular motive for any one to exert himself. On all great questions of domestic or of foreign policy a resolution passed by it counts for absolutely nothing. On the rare occasions, therefore, when it has a debate it is usually a debate of professors rather than of orators and statesmen.

Lord Rosebery made his first speech in the House of Lords at the opening of the session of 1871. Mr. Gladstone, then in power, selected him to second the address in the House of Lords. It was welcomed with general praise, but it did not create any great sensation; no speech made under such conditions could possibly create any great sensation. Later on when he endeavored to induce that highly conservative body of gentlemen to reform their institution from within and thus try to bring it into something like touch with the working of modern progress, it is needless to say that he did not succeed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would be hard to make it quite clear to American readers in general what sort of a body the English House of Lords is. Its vast majority is made up of Tory landlords. From father to son, to grandson, and great-grandson, and so on, descends the right of the Tory peer to make laws for the people of England. The Lords can reject any bill passed by the House of Commons, except indeed a money bill—a bill involving a question of taxation. Even this peculiar restriction has been obtained only in recent years by the resolute action of the House of Commons. The representative chamber may have spent weeks and even months in scheming out and bringing as near to completeness as may be some great measure of legislation, and it is in the power of the House of Lords to throw it out in a single night if the peers fancy that any of the interests or privileges of their order are affected by it. As Sydney Smith humorously said of that Irish state-church which Mr. Gladstone abolished, "Nothing that we know of the internal affairs of Timbuctoo would warrant us in the assumption that such an institution would be endured there." Lord Rosebery gallantly tried more than once to get the House of Lords to reform itself, but the peers preferred to wait until the inevitable besom of intelligent political progress comes to sweep them out of the way. It is interesting to observe how consistent Lord Rosebery has been in his opinions and his action with regard to the House of Lords. At present he is resolutely on the side of those who think the time is not appropriate for either the demolition or the complete reconstruction of the hereditary chamber. He holds that the Liberal party have so many important measures of domestic reform on hand, measures of the most immediate and pressing necessity, that they have no time to spend on the gigantic work of completely reorganizing or completely abolishing the Lords. What he contends is that the Liberal party ought to go sternly in for the policy of restricting its veto—refusing it the right of rejecting more than once a bill sent up from the Commons. If the Commons send up a bill, the Lords, according to Lord Rosebery's idea, should be allowed to reject it once. If the Commons reconsider the bill, and having reconsidered it persevere in their purpose and send it up a second time, then he would take away from the hereditary chamber the privilege of again rejecting it. This reform he believes could be easily carried after a general election, whereas the complete reorganization of the House of Lords would involve an infinity of delay and detail. There would be at the very outset a prolonged and a fierce struggle over the preliminary ques-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, whether we ought to have a second chamber of any kind. Mr. Labouchere and some other advanced radicals are for rushing at the institution at once and reducing it to ruins before we attempt anything else. Mr. Labouchere's voice, like that of the fallen angel in Paradise Lost, is still for open war—of wiles more inexpert he boasts not.

However, I am not at present going to enter into the argument—I am concerned only to show that whether Lord Rosebery be right or wrong in his views they are not views formed on the spur of the moment. Nearly ten years ago, addressing a public meeting on the reform of the House of Lords, he declared that he was ready for either abolition or reform because he knew that our institutions were made for the people and not the people for the institutions; but he hoped that reform would be tried before abolition. He condemned the House of Lords severely as "a caucus which considered all measures from a purely Conservative point of view and gave Liberal measures no chance at all." These are in substance the opinions which he is expressing to-day. On another subject, too, he has proved himself a man of resolute and consistent views. More than eight years ago he spoke in favor of appointing working-men to the magistracy. Even at so recent a period as that, such a suggestion was thought by all steady men with well-balanced minds and well-balanced banking-books to be one of the wildest flights of audacious Radicalism. Working-men appointed to the Commission of the Peace! As if the magisterial bench were not reserved by heaven and nature for the gentry of every civilized country! Lord Rosebery's suggestion has already been realized. Since the return of the Liberals to power, working-men have been appointed to the magistracy in several places. There was a time, and not so very many years ago, when it was thought an astounding innovation that a working-man should sit in the House of Commons. Now there is a Labor party in that House, and there is also an independent Labor party which refuses all political alliances but does not count for many votes in the division lobby.

Lord Rosebery was condemned for a long time to be what we may describe as an ornamental speaker. He unveiled monuments; he opened charitable bazaars; he delivered addresses on the presentation of a gift-park by some rich and beneficent citizen; he was endowed with the freedom of a city here and a city there; he was made president of many institutions. On all these occasions he was sure to brighten and enrich the subject by fresh and happy illustration. There was much of the amateur, much of the *dilettante* about it, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every one said, "He will grow." I first heard of him as a brilliant after-dinner speaker at literary and theatrical banquets. He then appeared to be a young man given naturally more to literature and the drama than to the dry work of politics. He was looked upon as one who had more inclination for the pleasures than the business of life. He was a racing man, fond of the turf and of all that belonged to it. Now it is distinctly in favor of a man's popularity in England that he should be a votary of the turf. The people do not desire that their leading statesmen should be ascetics. It is an additional attraction in a public man that he should be a lover of sport in one form or another. Many a sturdy Tory softened toward John Bright because he was known to be an ardent lover of trout and salmon-fishing. Mr. Parnell was once enthusiastically cheered by the Tory squires in the House of Commons when he declared, on the occasion of some discussion about hunting, that in Ireland he never saw a man in the field look out for a gap, and that if Englishmen came to his native county he would show them what was meant by straight riding across country. Much as the Tory squires detested his political principles, they thought there must be something in the man who thus entered into the spirit of the hunting-field. Therefore Lord Rosebery's love of sport scored heavily for him with one section of the community, and his after-dinner speaking and his love of the theatre scored heavily for him with another. He began public life under distinctly favorable auspices. He did not pass his time quite idly in the House of Lords. He was a man of too much energy and buoyancy and eloquence to remain an absolutely silent member.

Then he was known to be a man of high culture. He was selected Lord Rector of the University of Aberdeen in 1878, and Lord Rector of the University of Edinburgh in 1880, and he was fond of the society of authors and men of letters. He had indeed a great many sides to his character. As Savage Landor's words put it, he "warmed both hands before the fire of life." He stretched out eagerly for every wholesome occupation and amusement that existence could give him. Other men of his station moved along one groove and only one. The man of the turf was a man of the turf and nothing more. The politician was a politician; the scholar lived with his books. But Lord Rosebery seemed to want to grasp at everything and to accomplish everything. This gave him a great start at the beginning, for it made him known in all circles. Later on, as we shall see, it proved to be rather against him for the moment, when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people began to ask whether such a man, endowed with such various tastes and accomplished in such different ways, could be quite grave enough and serious enough for the business of a prime minister. The bright humor that flashed with such effect over a public dinner-table—was that, heavy people asked, the sort of gift that solid Englishmen desired in the leader of a government? We have seen quite lately how Mr. Chamberlain was affected by one of Lord Rosebery's easy jokes. Mr. Chamberlain is a man who in many ways might be set up as an exact contrast to Lord Rosebery. Mr. Chamberlain is a shrewd, clever business man and a keen debater in the House of Commons. But he has no culture and no reading. He is blind to all that side of life which is occupied by literature and art. He has apparently been made by nature with an absolute lack of any sense of humor. Yet he now belongs to a party which claims to have all the scholarship of England at its back. Lord Rosebery was ridiculing this preposterous pretension, and he ridiculed it after the fashion familiar since the days of Socrates, by affecting to treat it as a serious fact and to deplore it. He carried his sarcastic admissions so far as to declare that he did not suppose there was a member of the Liberal party who could spell a word with two syllables. Mr. Chamberlain positively accepted that as a serious admission and wrote a letter to the "Times" to denounce Lord Rosebery for having triumphed in the fact that the government of the British Empire was now given over to men of absolute ignorance! However, it would be futile to take much trouble to expose Mr. Chamberlain's lack of humor, and I use the illustration only to show what may have been a difficulty in the way of Lord Rosebery when he came to be Prime Minister. After all there must be a good many Englishmen as deficient in a sense of humor as Mr. Chamberlain. In other words, the wittiest Prime Minister has to bear in mind how deep the dulness even of clever men can sometimes go down.

Lord Rosebery has filled all manner of offices. He was for a time Under-Secretary for Home Affairs. But he considered very sensibly that in order to be a really efficient Under-Secretary for Home Affairs it is almost indispensable that one should be a member of the House of Commons, always on the spot ready for consultation with his chief. Then he was for a time First Commissioner of Works and had in his charge all the public buildings of the metropolis, a position for which his artistic tastes and culture made him peculiarly fitted. In Mr. Gladstone's short administration of 1885 and 1886 he received for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the first time an office of the highest rank: he became Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. That was the administration during which Mr. Gladstone introduced his Home Rule bill. The bill was a failure. It was defeated in the House of Commons by a combination between the Tories and the followers of Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, who called themselves Liberal-Unionists. Mr. Gladstone went out of office, and therefore Lord Rosebery had only about six months' time to show what he could do in the conduct of foreign affairs. It happened to be a difficult, a delicate, and even a troublous time. But he succeeded in impressing all Europe with a full conviction of his thorough capacity for the work of such a place. From that time he began to be looked upon as a possible competitor for the yet greater place of Prime Minister. But every one then assumed that it would be a long day before there was a vacancy in that place within the Liberal party.

I have shown Lord Rosebery as a man of many occupations. But I must say something of another occupation to which he gave himself up with surprising energy. When the London County Council was formed, a great representative body to which was entrusted the municipal management of nearly all London, Lord Rosebery became one of the most hard-working members of that very hard-working body of men. For a long time he held the office of chairman of this County Council. I declare for myself, as a man not quite unused to hard work, that I think the chairmanship of the London County Council is business enough for anybody. It would be enough for me, without looking after studs and racing, without presiding over commissions and committees, without being Secretary for Foreign Affairs, without speaking at all manner of public meetings in all parts of the country; without delivering after-dinner speeches; without preparing rectorial addresses to universities, and without trying to reform the House of Lords. Lord Rosebery, however, continued to be for a long time one of the most regular attendants at the County Council meetings. During all this time he took and made manifest the deepest interest in the vast and complicated question of Imperial Federation. Not a lazy nobleman of the traditional sort most certainly—no Lord Foppington was there. Yet to look at Lord Rosebery one might fancy him the very personification of bright, easy, elegant idlers. He does not seem to be energetic. He does not appear to have any great desire to do anything except emit a joke. He looks as if he ought to wear the costume of the eighteenth century,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and amuse Lady Teazle by his careless indolence and refined do-nothing ways. Perhaps there is some storage of mental and physical energy which is best accomplished by the apparent suppression and imprisonment of both until the actual moment comes for letting them go free. I have made some such idle conjecture in other cases as well as in that of Lord Rosebery.

Not content with all the various vocations and avocations which I have told of, Lord Rosebery has made at least one considerable addition to English literature. I am speaking of his one-volume life of the younger Pitt which was published three or four years ago. The book makes but a small volume and belongs to a series called "Twelve English Statesmen," to which Frederic Harrison contributed "Oliver Cromwell" and John Morley gave "Walpole" and "Chatham." The preface to Lord Rosebery's volume contains a touching allusion: "This little book has been written under many d. advantages, but with a sincere desire to ascertain the truth. My chief happiness in completing it would have been to give it to my wife; it can now only be inscribed to her memory." Since the death of his wife, in 1890, he can hardly be said to have re-entered social life, but he did not allow himself to turn long from his public work. The volume on Pitt was received with something like a unanimous cry of praise from the newspapers. The personal popularity of the man counted for much. Everybody was glad that anything he put a hand to should be done well. Sympathy with his recent loss counted for something also. But the book itself undoubtedly deserved much of the praise that was given to it. To begin with, it had all that quality which, for want of a more refined form of description, I must be allowed to call "go." It carried the reader along with it from cover to cover. The literary style was excellent and indeed was often brilliant. The character-drawing was bold and vivid and yet keen and refined. The pictures of Pitt, of Burke, of Fox, had about them something of the character of studies from the life.

Lord Rosebery is one of the most charming talkers I have met. The word "charming" best describes the peculiarity of his talk. He has read an immensity of literature. He does not profess to be a scholar, I suppose, in the strictest sense of the word, but he certainly has read and appreciated a great variety of books. It would be hard to find out the book of our time or of others about which he cannot talk. I can hardly imagine a conversation being started among educated people in which he is not qualified to bear a leading part. One

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can only wonder more and more at the fresh, keen interest which he takes in everything that pertains to life near or far, past or present. The minds of most of us travel steadily along ruts or grooves and our minds' eyes cast no glance aside or abroad. The mind of Lord Rosebery seems to glance around the whole horizon.

In 1892 came the momentous General Election which brought Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party back to office. Lord Rosebery again became Foreign Secretary. It was well known long before that, in the event of Mr. Gladstone's becoming Prime Minister, he would take up again that work of Irish Home Rule which he had been reluctantly compelled to put down in 1886. The bill was brought in and it was carried safely through the House of Commons. Then came the old familiar question, "What will the Lords do with it?" The majority in favor of the measure in the House of Commons was only forty-three, on the second reading: not a majority likely to overbear the hostile hereditary chamber. One of the events in the political career of Lord Rosebery, one of the most considerable events, was his speech in the House of Lords on the second reading of the Home Rule bill. The occasion was great. The whole anxiety and interest of the country centred themselves on the House of Lords. The peers, who are elected by nobody, who can be displaced by nobody, who are responsible to nobody, had in their hands the destruction of a momentous measure of reform. The reform measures rejected by the House of Lords are always passed in the end, but the long delay has often brought the country within measurable distance of revolution. When it comes to that, the Lords give way; and thus they invariably fail to fulfil their boasted part of standing between the sacred institutions of the country and the encroachments of a wild democracy. Therefore a crisis when the Lords set themselves against the Commons is always one of very serious anxiety. Then indeed the peers who are eloquent have a breathless audience for their speeches.

This night of Lord Rosebery's speech was a memorable one. The chamber and its galleries were crowded as I have seldom seen them. Let me as a member of the House of Commons be magnanimous enough to admit that on a night of great debate the House of Lords completely outshines in spectacular effect anything that the representative chamber can display. The decorations are far more gorgeous, but that is not the chief reason for the superiority of the pictorial effect. In the House of Lords the peeresses and their women friends sit in open galleries extending along either side of the chamber. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

galleries are brilliant and many-hued with evening dress. In the House of Commons we huddle a few women into a cage with a grating in front of it. Then in the House of Lords there is the throne, on the steps of which and at the railing before it privy councillors are privileged to sit or stand. Unquestionably the "upper chamber" is a magnificent sight on an evening of great debate. On this evening when Lord Rosebery spoke I was compelled to be somewhat late, and the speech had already begun. The space reserved below-stairs—on the level of the floor of the House—for members of the Commons was crowded to excess, and looking up I could see that the little gallery allotted to us up-stairs was, if possible, even more crowded still. I therefore remained where I was, at the back of everybody—quite near the door. Lord Rosebery spoke with perfect clearness and apparent ease. His voice was melodious and sometimes thrilling in its sound. But the distance and the intervening crowd prevented me from following uninterruptedly the words and the reasoning of the speech. The acoustic properties of the chamber are not to be commended, and I lost much of the argument. I mention this personal fact only because of the considerable bewilderment in which I was left when I came to gather the opinions of men who had heard every word spoken. Every one agreed that the speech was admirably delivered and was brilliant with sparkling rhetoric. But as to the argument and the probable effect of the speech there was, even among Irish Home Rulers, the widest difference of opinion. Some men declared that never since Mr. Gladstone's last speech on the same subject had there been so splendid an exposition of the case for Home Rule. Another set of men insisted that the speech fell wholly below the level of the subject, and that its only object seemed to be to make Home Rule appear so small a thing as not to be worth any serious alarm on the part of the House of Lords. Another man admitted that such was the impression made on his mind by the speech, but he contended that that must have been Lord Rosebery's deliberate purpose and that it was the most politic way of dealing with the subject. Yet another man spoke with anger of Lord Rosebery because he had commended Home Rule on the ground that it would pay England in the end, and then yet another asked triumphantly whether such was not the best possible way to recommend Home Rule to the English people. I am not now speaking of what I heard Tories or Liberal Unionists say in criticism of the speech—those of whom I am talking were men who were sincerely anxious, every one of them, that Lord

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rosebery should score a splendid success. "*Il n'est pas arrivé cette fois?*" I asked of one friend who on the whole was disappointed. "Come—no—not yet—but he'll come another time," was the answer. That indeed became my own impression from a comparison of differences of opinion. It was the old puzzle over again. It is a puzzle still. Why did he not put forth all his strength? Nobody said—or says to-day—that he has put forth all his strength and done all he can do.

The Lords threw out the Home Rule bill, and the government of Gladstone turned itself for the time to other legislation. All the Liberalism and Radicalism of the country began to cry out that something must be done with the House of Lords. Mr. Gladstone gave splendid voice to the feelings of all true Liberals in that noble speech which was, although not every listener knew it at the time, his farewell to the Premiership and probably to the House of Commons. That closing speech was one calm, strong exhortation to the people of these countries not to allow the will of the constituencies to be overborne and frustrated any longer by the permanent vote of the hereditary chamber. With such admonition the curtain fell upon that great political career. Then succeeded a period of utmost anxiety. Who was to be Prime Minister—who was to succeed Mr. Gladstone? Whoever the man called to that place he would be put in a most unenviable position—a position of utmost difficulty—in having to follow the greatest Prime Minister of the present century. The ambition of no man, it might well be thought, could be so far-reaching and so self-confident as to contemplate without the deepest doubt the chances and the inevitable contrasts of such a succession. Still, there must be somebody. Who was it to be?

It was soon settled in men's minds that there were only two possible men for the position. These two men were Lord Rosebery and Sir William Harcourt, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The choice of a Prime Minister rests nominally with the sovereign, but of course it is well understood that the sovereign acts on the advice given to her by her ministers. Very soon there were two distinct parties among the Liberal ranks. I cannot venture to say that there were two parties at the moment in the cabinet itself, although rumor with her usual confidence had no hesitation in vouching for such a fact. Sir William Harcourt is a much older man than Lord Rosebery and has had a long experience of the House of Commons, whereof Lord Rosebery had had no experience at all. Sir William Harcourt for a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

considerable time had the leadership of that House in the absence of Mr. Gladstone. He is one of the most powerful debaters in the House of Commons and one of the most powerful speakers on the public platform. As what may be called a "slogging" debater, he has perhaps no fellow in Parliament. But he was not somehow very popular then with the House or with the country. He had a way of making enemies. He was thought to be overbearing in manner. I may be allowed to say for myself personally that I did not find those disagreeable qualities in him.

Lord Rosebery became Prime Minister. Gladstone's farewell speech was delivered on Thursday, March the first, in the House of Commons. May I mention as a matter of purely personal history that on the following Monday, March the fifth, I called on Mr. Gladstone at his written request? I saw him in his official residence in Downing Street which he still occupied, saw him there for the last time. He was full of good spirits and hope; he had sent for me with the chief purpose of assuring me that his devotion to the Irish cause, the cause of Home Rule, was undying, and was as warm in his heart then as ever. He sent a most kindly message to my colleagues, a message of encouragement and hope and faith. He gave his blessing to our cause and to our work. It was an interview not easily to be forgotten.

That same day Parliament was prorogued, having sat with little interval for more than a year. On Monday, March the twelfth, the new session began. All the political world was watching with the most absorbing interest and anxiety to hear what the new Prime Minister would say in the House of Lords in the debate on the address. The Irish Nationalists were longing to know whether he would go strongly and directly enough in favor of Home Rule. The extreme English Radicals were equally anxious to know whether he would speak out clearly enough against the House of Lords. The Tories and the Liberal Unionists were almost inflated with the hope that he would say something which must disappoint the Irish and the extreme Radicals alike. Some few of the extreme Radicals headed by Mr. Labouchere had already declared against him. By these it was insisted that it was impossible to expect that a member of the House of Lords could ever bring himself to declare firmly in favor of a campaign against the chamber to which he himself belonged. It has to be borne in mind all this time that the majority by which the Liberal party had been brought back into office was by no means overwhelm-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing, was in fact but narrow. The hope, therefore, of the Tories and the Liberal Unionists and the irreconcilable Radicals, including those few who are described as the Independent Labor party, was that if Lord Rosebery showed any kind of weakness or wavering in his utterances in the debate on the address, the result would be such a falling off in votes on some critical division in the House of Commons as to bring the government down to a minority, or at all events to a majority so small as to make it impossible for a Prime Minister with any spirit to continue to hold office. Now the worst of Lord Rosebery's political enemies—he has no personal enemies—never accused him of a want of spirit. The worst of his political enemies never accused him of any undue desire to cling to office. On the contrary what we all heard his opponents saying about him, here, there, and everywhere, was that he did not care at all about staying in office; that he was indifferent about the whole concern; that he lacked earnestness in political life and would be only too glad to get out of the whole trouble and to be a free man to attend to his horses, to his after-dinner speeches and his unveiling of public monuments again.

It must be owned that Lord Rosebery had a difficult part to play when he rose to speak on the address in reply to Lord Salisbury. He played it with a light hand if not with a very light heart. His speech appeared to have expressed just his own opinions without the slightest regard for political consequences. It was a clear and strong proclamation of Liberal policy. But it undoubtedly disappointed some of his followers. Among other things it seemed to declare that Home Rule could never be carried until "the predominant partner" in the affairs of the three kingdoms—England, that is to say—had fully given her assent to the measure. The point of this was in the fact that while Ireland, Scotland, and Wales returned majorities overwhelmingly in favor of Home Rule, England herself had a majority which was Tory and opposed to Home Rule. Now this of course was cold comfort to some of Lord Rosebery's supporters. If this, they said, is to be considered as a United Kingdom, then it is a question of a distinct majority of the people, and not of a minority preponderating over a majority, because the minority happens to be in England and the majority is in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. In counting votes at a general election we count the whole country, the three kingdoms, as one. If we count in any other way, what becomes of the theory that there are equal laws for England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales? I do not believe that Lord Rosebery meant anything

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the kind. I am sure he only meant to point to the obvious fact that so soon as we can get to the side of Home Rule the majority in England as we have it already in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, then the struggle is practically over and done with, and that great reform, destined to be the parent of other great reforms, is carried and the principle of federation on equal terms under the Imperial Parliament is established. But the saying was unlucky at the moment. It was too calmly philosophical for the atmosphere of a great political struggle. It might have come well enough in such a discourse as Lord Rosebery lately delivered when he unveiled the statue of Burke in Bristol, but it was not quite the thing for a political argument. Lord Rosebery did not perhaps at the moment feel all the tremendous weight of responsibility with which his new position has burdened him. He did not perhaps quite know what an echo his every word must now give back in the exalted political atmosphere to which his intellect and his energy and his eloquence had lifted him up. But he is, above all other things, a man to learn of the passing events, and he may, I firmly believe, be trusted to throw his whole soul for the time into his single work.

Thus, therefore, the puzzle remains somewhat of a puzzle still. Lord Rosebery has undoubtedly gained distinct strength in the opinion of all but a very few of the Liberal party since he accepted the position of Prime Minister. In each succeeding speech that he has made in the country his utterances have been more clear, more outspoken, and more decisive. I am not writing in the spirit of a partisan; for those with whom I am associated are bound to neither of the great parties in England. The American public, to whom I am now addressing myself, cares nothing for our party divisions here on this side of the Atlantic. But Lord Rosebery is a Liberal and a man of progress by natural inclination, by training, and by intellect. He is exactly the kind of man who could not be a Tory if he were to try. He is a man of movement, a reformer; it is his temper, his character, to look forward. Therefore the career of such a man must depend on his continuing to be the leader of the Liberal party. He has the strength for the place. Nobody doubts that. Will he put forth his strength? Will he cease absolutely to play the part of an amateur in politics? I am convinced that it depends only upon himself to become, in the truest sense, a great English Prime Minister.

JUSTIN M'CARTHY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUPPRESSION OF THE LOTTERY AND OTHER GAMBLING.

FREQUENT agitation in the newspapers, and the records of legislation for the past two years, show that a vigorous awakening of public sentiment is taking place concerning modern forms of gambling. The first known law against gaming belongs to ancient history: the Egyptians condemned gamblers to the quarries; the last enactment against it was passed in November, 1894, when the people of the State of New York adopted the constitutional amendment relative to gaming. Some of the bankers and merchants, however, of the city of Denver, Colorado, have taken exception to this general course of history and law from ancient Egypt to modern New York; for they recently petitioned for the opening of gaming houses as a legitimate part of the business of that enterprising American town. But elsewhere throughout the United States the movement has been gaining momentum for the sweeping away of all kinds of public gaming. Two years ago the existence of a flourishing pool-room where "the races were played," in close proximity to Yale University, led several citizens of New Haven to secure from the legislature a statute aimed directly against that demoralizing form of gaming. Connecticut was the first New England State to enact such legislation, and the pool-room in New Haven has been closed, and kept closed, since the law went into effect. Subsequently New Jersey succeeded in freeing its legislature from the shameless control of the race-track gamblers; and the State of New York has passed effective laws of the same tenor. Three contiguous States have thus sought to drive gambling upon the races from their borders.

So long as interstate commerce in gambling matters has not been effectually prohibited by the laws of the United States, the agents of lottery companies and the local backers of the policy-business have been able to receive regularly the materials and dispatches necessary for the conduct of their business in spite of the enactments of State legislatures. The last annual report of the Assistant Attorney-General for the Post Office Department states that "the lottery-business

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conducted through the express companies has increased enormously during the year in the direct ratio of the decrease of the business through the mails." Recent raids made by the police of New Haven, at the instance of the Law and Order League, upon the headquarters of the lottery and also of the policy-business in that city, revealed the astonishing extent of those forms of gaming, and showed also the nature and amount of the aid and abetment in their poverty-breeding business which they receive from rich corporations like the express and telegraph companies. The account book of the agent of the lottery companies was seized, and it showed that large amounts of money had been sent by him through the express companies all over southern New England. While the lottery agents rely upon the express companies for facilities for conducting their business, the policy-writers find their daily allies in the telegraph companies. Their demoralizing business cannot be carried on in any city or large town in New England, if by any legal means the telegraph companies can be compelled not to receive or deliver messages which are material parts of gambling transactions contrary to the laws of the State.

Fortunately, in the closing hours of the last Congress, a law prohibiting the transmission of gambling matter from State to State by mail, express, or other agencies,—a law which up to that time had been successfully "held up" by a powerful monetary interest,—was finally put upon its passage; and by its enactment another triumph of the national conscience has been won. It will prove a needed and effective weapon against the allied gambling interests of the country. If hereafter the Western Union Telegraph Company pleads its inability to distinguish between legitimate dispatches, and telegrams which are regularly received and delivered for gambling purposes, it should receive governmental assistance until it can learn the difference between good and evil. There is no intrinsic reason—no reason which the people when they see the wrong done to them will long tolerate—why a great corporation should be allowed for private gain to run a wire into a gambling headquarters, where the United States Government will not permit its carriers to deliver at the door letters containing gaming matter. If good economic reasons may be adduced against the governmental ownership of telegraphs, good moral reasons may also be adduced for such governmental supervision of the telegraph and express business as shall be sufficient at least to protect the moral welfare of the people from corporate negligence or greed.

The forms under which the natural human propensity for games

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of hazard seeks for gratification change curiously from time to time. A game which the gamblers of one generation may have seized upon is abandoned by the players of the next; and what once was associated with evil may thus be left without harm in the hands of the innocent. Hence it is always a question of moral interest to ascertain upon what particular games or competitions the betting habit is fastening itself. Some older and familiar forms of gambling are not now the most popularly harmful. A few years ago, lotteries at church fairs, and various devices of philanthropic raffling, might have been mentioned among the beginnings of evil; and their fair promoters were the thoughtless sowers of seeds whose later fruits fell to the possession of the gamblers. But no respectable church nowadays would permit such temptations in the name of charity; and it would hardly be regarded as unwarrantable persecution if any remnant of these practices in charitable and religious circles should be virtuously seized upon by the prosecuting attorneys. Public attention at the present time is turned to some comparatively new fields in which the habit of betting is cultivated; for some modern methods of converting large numbers of people into habitual gamblers have sprung up and been allowed to flourish untouched by the laws, and indeed have scarcely been observed by the better portions of the community. It may be said with much truth, although with some paradox, that the worst forms of gambling are not the most popularly harmful. Roulette wheels still spin their whirling fascinations in secret places; and by means of artful contrivances the hidden gambling-dens render their detection difficult,—as in one such place, recently raided by the police in one of our cities, it was found that every third step in the stairway had been connected with the gambling-room by electric bells, so that any intruder's approach might at once be signalled. But these secret dens, by reason of their necessary concealments, cannot spread so wide and alluring a temptation as do certain open places for betting which have done a lucrative business of late at the more populous centres. At present the three most popular—and consequently most demoralizing—forms of gambling are the betting on athletic games, the policy-shop, and the pool-room where the "races are played."

With regard to the former comparatively more innocent practice of betting in connection with athletic sports, any one who cares to read the columns of the papers for some days before a great football game may form some idea not only of the manner in which the higher education in this country is running to the spectacular, but also of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the extent to which college games are becoming purveyors to the public of the vulgarizing habit of betting. College athletics are threatened in this country with the same peril which is said to have contributed to the decline of the great games in Greece,—they declined as they became mercenary.

The second prevalent method of generating a taste for betting and educating the people into gamblers is the peculiar institution known as the policy-shop. It requires but little apparatus for its business; and the most simple-minded can play it. It consists simply in betting upon numbers, or combinations of numbers, to be drawn from given series of figures. Policy-playing is the thriving offspring of the lottery. In it the poorest may wager their pittance, and large odds may be offered them. It is the form of gambling which is the especial privilege of the working-classes, and its agents haunt the workshops. It seems also to have a peculiar charm for the colored population, although by no means, as is sometimes supposed, confined to them. One peculiar characteristic of policy-playing is its appeal to superstition. The policy-player has a dream-book. Objects which frequently recur in dreams have their numbers; and the dreamer learns from his book on what numbers to lay his bet. In most of our cities the policy-shops have come to be what Seneca called some of the gambling places of his time, "houses not afraid of the magistrates." Yet in our larger towns these policy-shops take every week from the wages of the people more money than all the charities of the churches together can pour in for the relief of poverty. Where the general American habit of local civic indifference tolerates this evil, the spectacle is furnished of a society helping the poor with a pint of pious charity, and allowing them at the same time to be robbed of a quart of earnings. The church that should put half a charitable contribution into the work of suppressing policy-playing, might find less need for use of the other half of its contribution in relief of the poor. Some idea of the money taken by these gamblers, mostly from the poorer classes, may be gained from the fact that a single policy-writer in New Haven, in one of the less favorable locations for his business, has returned every week from four hundred to seven hundred dollars to the policy headquarters in that city.

This form of law-breaking is persistent, and it can be broken up in any city only by equally persistent attention to it on the part of citizens determined to drive it out. Investigation in many New England cities might show this thieving business to be as flourishing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as it once was in New Haven, where for two years the headquarters of it occupied two stories of a business block in the heart of the city. Only after two years of determined effort in New Haven has the way into the jail been opened for some of these robbers of the wages of the people; but the success which such effort is now meeting in that city may serve as an encouragement for a needed persistent crusade against this evil in other cities.

A third form of popular gambling has lately been brought to public attention by the agitation against it in several States. The pool-rooms in which the "races are played," or the pretended commission houses which transmit bets to the races, have lately become a flourishing agency for gambling, with houses and branch offices at the centres of population, and runners and telephone connections reaching out for the country trade. This means of playing the races was becoming one of the most extensively ramified methods of gambling ever known, until popular agitation aroused legislative action against it. Pool-selling, even when confined to the actual time and place of the races, is so demoralizing that the question may be fairly put to those who love horses, whether any benefit which the toleration of pool-selling at the races may be supposed to confer on the breeding of horses, can equal the harm which it does to the breeding of men. Our cities cannot permit pool-selling all the year round on the racing of horses, without sowing a perpetual crop of dishonesty and defalcations among clerks and employees in positions of trust. The manager of one of these rooms, in a private letter to me, admits that this kind of betting is demoralizing on account of its fascination, especially to novices. The history of this gambling business furnishes a record of embezzlements and defalcations, of wreck of men and ruin of families, such as scarcely another agency in the annals of crime can equal. It has exercised a fatal fascination over persons of all ages, and from almost every walk of life. It "robs the cradle and the grave." Those States which have not already amended and sharpened their general gambling statutes to meet this peculiar kind of commission betting, will need to take vigilant action, or the managers of these rooms, driven from New York, Connecticut, and even New Jersey, by recent legislation, will transfer their operations—races, pool-rooms, telegraph instruments, and all—to those States where the laws offer to them the least resistance. Uniform and adequate legislation is needed all over the country in order to wrest from this gambling greed the spoils of the wages of the people, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it gathers in large quantities wherever it is permitted to show its rapacious hand. An interstate law, forbidding under heavy penalties the use of telegraphic facilities for this purpose, or the running by telegraph companies of wires into known gambling rooms, might cut off with one blow the main artery of this body of corruption.

The means by which large and financially powerful gambling interests may be successfully attacked, require careful study on the part of practical men who wish to rid their localities of this deeply rooted and profitable evil. Some helpful light is thrown upon the practical methods of such reformatory work by the measures which proved successful in securing the passage of an anti-pool-room law by the last legislature of Connecticut. This law was not secured by holding indignation meetings, where good speakers may enjoy their own eloquence, and, when all has been said, think that all has been done. But a plan was pursued of quiet, systematic visitation of all the Representatives at their homes, when on Sundays they were away from the insidious influence of the lobby at the State capitol; and by means of many letters and much personal work the coöperation of influential persons all over the State was secured. Our favorite method of civic reform is too much one of drums and trumpets; but, although ringing notes may be required to arouse the public conscience, active and persistent personal work, and much of it, is needed for the successful achievement of any good legislative act. The lobby cannot be beaten by honest men at its own game in the secret places of a State capitol; but it may be successfully coped with, if enough good citizens in every country town and village will lay a watchful hand on their Representatives when they come home Sundays.

In view of the recent and increasing agitation against public gambling in its present most popular forms, a renewed discussion of the ethics of betting is timely. Some persons who would condemn habitual gambling in view of its ruinous consequences, may be inclined to tolerate as comparatively harmless a moderate indulgence in the mild excitement of small betting. The playing of poker for trifling sums of money would thus be permitted, if not justified, by the "smart set" in some old New England communities. It will be alleged that trifling wagers, which all who take part in such games can afford to lose, threaten no serious consequences, and may serve to add a certain zest to healthful amusement; and, recreation being admitted to be at times morally desirable, a needed stimulus to it may also be morally admissible. If a jaded mind can be spurred to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the recreation it requires by the sight of a small stake, the sport which is needed has been held to justify the means. Hence the question as to the morality of betting, even in small amounts, resolves itself into a question concerning the kind of stimulus which the offer of a wager lends to games or athletic sports. Is that kind of spice to amusement good or bad, vitalizing or ethically debilitating? What, then, when we analyze it, is the peculiar zest which the offer of a wager gives to a game or sport?

The older moralists condemned betting beause they detected the secret of its motive to be covetousness. The evil in betting was not supposed to lie in the mere appeal to chance, but in a covetous regard for money. Jeremy Taylor, having admitted that an appeal to chance is a legitimate means of recreation, proceeds to put betting under the ban of an illegitimate motive: "He that means to make his game lawful must not play for money, but for recreation. . . . For the gaining of money can have no influence into the game to make it more recreative, unless covetousness hold the box." He remarks of all games,—and this word of the genial moralist of the seventeenth century has special force in its application to college athletics in these days,—"Money is the way to abuse them all." The saintly George Herbert indicated a similar rule, while seemingly relaxing a little its application, when he wrote:

> "Play not for gain, but sport. Who plays for more
> Than he can lose with pleasure, stakes his heart."

Many bets are undoubtedly made when any conscious covetousness could not easily be detected in the motives of those who back their opinions or their sports with some small wager; but, nevertheless, the incentive which is added by any bet is the addition of some fictitious value, however small it may be. It is sought by a bet to lend a value to the game or amusement over and beyond the recreative value in the sport itself. Betting is thus always a playing for something foreign to the amusement naturally afforded by the game which is played. This adulteration of amusement by a foreign motive, this addition of a fictitious zest to a pure pleasure, may in given instances be of no serious consequence; but it is an adulteration of it with the same false principle of gaining something for nothing which in larger measures and grosser forms is the corruption of gambling. A thoroughly wholesome moral nature, able to take honest recreation, is inclined to resent this doubtful spicing of its amusement. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

habit of betting will seem to it to be a vulgarizing of sport, even if it involves no further and worse consequences.

The ethics of betting should not be estimated simply, however, or mainly, from an individualistic point of view, for the laying a wager of any kind is a social act, having social relations; and its morality is a question, not of its effect merely upon the character of the individual, but also of its social consequences. The wager is ordinarily something which has value in exchange. Money is itself a social product; and property of all kinds is not only an individual possession with which the owner may do as he pleases, but to some extent there is a reserved communal interest in all property, and society has some concern which is to be protected in all material values. It follows, therefore, that the ethics of betting cannot be determined simply by affirming the right of an individual to do what he pleases with his own, or by judging merely the consequences of betting as they may be observed on the scale of the individual's own welfare. The question whether a man has a moral right to offer or to take a bet is something more than a question of his own pleasure, or his possession of means to make good his possible loss. It is not only a question whether he can afford it, but whether the community can afford to let him make or lose money in that particular way. Our modern scientific ethics is in the habit of judging between that which is morally desirable or undesirable by an induction of the social consequences rather than by a minute inspection of personal motives. Even then, though the objection of the older moralists should be set aside, and no improper adulteration of covetous motive be detected in the zest which betting may be said to add to amusement, the morality of a wager must still be judged by the test of known social consequences. Human experience, however, has but one testimony to give concerning the social consequences of transactions in which men seek to gain something for nothing. The argument against betting which is to be derived from social ethics would proceed, first, from the principles to be derived from economic science concerning exchange without value received; and, secondly, from the ethical obligation to respect economic laws. This argument against gambling, which could be drawn from the ethical obligation of economic principles, might then be enforced by those considerations of the social welfare which an altruistic morality sanctions, and it could be illumined in the light of the universal principle of mutual benefit and service, which is the Christian law of love.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More practically important, however, than the discussion of the social ethics of betting which has just been suggested, may be to most men the effort to discriminate between transactions which are essentially of a gambling nature, and those business transactions which may be regarded as legitimate speculation. This is not always easy to do, as it is difficult to draw any hard and fast lines of definition by means of which to distinguish in the lowest forms of life the difference between the animal and the vegetable kingdom. Some vegetable forms seem to have certain characteristics ordinarily ascribed to animals; and some animals seem hardly distinguishable from vegetables. Yet every child knows the radical difference between the two kingdoms; and, whatever may be the difficulty of our definitions, no one with eyes to see would confuse the distinction between the grass of the fields and the cattle that graze in the meadows. Similarly the difference between legitimate and illegitimate speculation may be somewhat difficult to define, and there are forms of the one which seem to run over into the other kind of transaction; yet there is a line to be drawn between the two, and most honest men in any particular case would instinctively know how to draw it. There would be no doubt, for instance, that if a man should put upon a chance money which he does not have and has no means of making good, he would be engaged in a gambling transaction. To take any risks out of proportion to one's means is gambling. Still further, gambling may be defined in relation to the actuality of any transfer of goods, and by its relation to productive industry. The general abstract principle might be laid down that in proportion as a transfer of products, either already on hand or to be made, is undertaken as an exchange for value received, and for purposes of productive industry or social utility, it is a legitimate transaction, although it may be speculative,—but in proportion as any such transaction loses the element of business actuality, and ceases to have any direct connection with the ends of productive industry or social utility, in that proportion it loses also moral character and becomes illegitimate speculation.

The difficulty of attempting to regulate stock-gambling by law lies not only in the fact that forms of law for the regulation of such operations are easily evaded, but also in the fact that the ethical distinctions involved between legitimate and illegitimate speculation are not easily reducible to exact legal definition. It is always dangerous to legislate against abuses of power where the uses of such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power cannot first be clearly defined and protected. It is often wiser to put up with felt abuses than to destroy with them the true uses of enterprises or trusts which, if kept within their proper limits, might prove a benefit to the public. Laws against those who gamble with the industries of the people may easily be overdone to the injury of the public. No extreme theory, either of *laissez-faire* economics, or of paternal government, should determine legislation concerning industrial gambling; but the law should follow cautiously the inductions of experience, interfering with individual freedom of contract or combination only when it can be made in a particular instance to appear highly probable that legal restrictions will reach known evils without restraining legitimate industrial operations.

Whenever any form of social evil, like the pool-room, becomes so definitely localized and is so openly defiant in its vicious temptation that it can be directly hit by the law, there is no good reason why the law should not be evoked to strike it down. Evils which are evidently ripe for legal destruction should not be left to poison the air. This is not putting an exaggerated estimate upon the moral functions of the law. Nor is it indulging in any idle expectation of making a community virtuous by force of law. It is true that human passions can never be eradicated by placing laws on the statute book. The reserved ethical and religious forces are always the main reliance in making men. But it is not too much to ask of the State that known and demoralizing methods and places of betting and gambling be met by laws so explicit and so severe, that not only the higher courts may apply them with just interpretations, but that also the poorest prosecuting attorney and the ordinary police justice, though fools, cannot err therein.

In order that the present epidemic of betting, and the increase of the more demoralizing forms of gambling, may be effectually checked, something more, however, is needed than even a vigorous legal quarantine of a community against the sources of this moral contagion. I have it on good authority that children, from the lower classes especially, have been taught to play policy on their way to and from the public school. Some primary lessons in the ethics of betting might form a profitable part of the education which the state provides for the children of the people. The preparatory schools and colleges also have made large contributions to the practice of betting through their athletic games. Our leading universities in this respect have moral obligations to discharge to the community which they seem singularly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

backward in fulfilling; that university which shall be the first to find its voice on this subject, and to speak with something of the old-time moral power which formerly characterized our New England colleges, will find the reward of its moral courage in the response which it will awaken in the conscience of the whole country. But, as matters stand, our colleges and universities, by their silence and inaction in this respect, seem to be contributing, indirectly if not directly, to one of the most ruinous habits prevalent among the youth of the land. Our colleges owe it to themselves, and to the youth of the country, as well as to their most loyal alumni and friends, to become at once protestants and reformers in this field. No possible material prosperity can compensate for the loss of moral tone and vigor at our great educational centres. It would not be profitable if any New England college should gain a whole world of wealth, endowments, and students, and lose its own soul. Admiration for our modern Hercules becomes questionable when it tempts the higher education to serve the spectacular; it goes altogether too far to be tolerated by the moral sense of the community when it aids and fosters among the youth of the country habits which are contrary to wholesome morals. The growing demand, therefore, of the community upon our colleges for plain speaking and effective teaching concerning the ethics of betting, accompanied by some restrictive discipline, is a demand justified by the facts in the case. The press, likewise, and the pulpit may be instrumental in provoking a much-needed and effective popular discussion of gambling, especially in its local forms and immunities.

NEWMAN SMYTH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HEALTHFUL TONE FOR AMERICAN LITERATURE.

LOOKING to the future of American literature, the questions to-day most pertinent to its welfare are these: What are its younger makers believing? and, What are they doing? Before an answer is attempted, it is well to remind ourselves that America possesses a worthy and dignified literary past. The fact that our first great heptarchy of singers has lived and left a rich legacy of creative production is enough to justify the statement; nor is the native accomplishment by any means limited to the work of Bryant, Whittier, and Emerson, of Longfellow, Poe, Holmes, and Lowell. Time, which is as just in allotting a due period for vigorous effort as it is inexorable in announcing the arrival of the age of weakness and decadence, is on the side of a land like ours, young in years, materially strong, with its gaze by instinct forward and upward: all natural laws of development, personal or national, declare in our favor.

And as to themes and motives, surely no country offers more stimulus to literary endeavor. With its vast panorama of human types and diversified territories, its dramatic shifts of fortune, and its pressing problems and rapid changes in social condition, the United States affords a field not surpassed certainly by any one of the European nations where letters obtain recognition. The subject-matter is here, for those who have eyes to see and the forthright arm of performance. Nevertheless, that our makers of literature are in some danger of becoming comparatively insensitive to such robust and legitimate *stimuli*, is a conclusion forcing itself upon the earnest student. This is the day of the diffusion of culture and the spread of the cosmopolitan spirit, touching literature as they do all else: a fact which alone could explain that denationalization of themes and that adoption of transatlantic methods and models to be noted in some, though a minor part of, American work. The very advance in the knowledge and practice of literature as an art makes this inevitable, indeed. Again, specialization, the study of particular environments and local types, obtains to the exclusion of broader national motives—this being obvious at a glance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But if a better technique, cosmopolitanism, and attention to the local rather than to the national, may go some little way toward explaining the indubitable change in the current mood and mind of our *literati*, the main cause is not here: it lies deeper and is further to seek. The trouble comes from what our literary producers believe or are in danger of believing; it is in what may be called the negative spirit which broods over modern effort in letters that the chief menace is to be found. And since doing follows believing, the work will suffer unless the creed be changed; in truth, already has suffered, though in a less degree than is true of other lands where this mephitic influence strikes at the very vitals of all art.

The spirit that denies, as embodied in Mephistopheles, eats like an acid into the heart of endeavor; it is cynical and contemplative as against the creative and optimistic; but in presentment is smug and decent, *à la mode* in dress, and with the devil's hoof well hidden. In literature it is "artistic," in the jargon of the day. The paramount temptation of the newer generation of literary makers in this country is the acceptance, either by the conscious will or by the unwitting creative soul, of the "art-for-art's-sake" doctrine, that legacy of the French naturalistic school already, by the confession of its great leader, Zola, waning away after thirty years of dominance. In a sentence, this creed would sharply dissever art from ethics: it concedes no morality to literature save the morality of the fine phrase: it is the artist's business to reproduce nature, and he is in nowise implicated in the light-and-shade of his picture except to see to it that the copy is faithful. Taken over into fiction, poetry, and the drama from the sister art of painting, this banner-cry has resulted in a literary product whose foulness and lack of taste (accompanied often by great ability) one must hark back to the decadent classics to parallel.

The originative cause of this significant movement and manifestation has not, so far as I have observed, been honestly set down. To say that it is the result simply of the increased perception of art, a natural evolution of the broader conception of technique and the extension of the *métier* of literature, is to trifle with non-essentials, begging the whole question. The plain truth is that the mood in art and literature conveniently summarized by the cant term "art for art's sake," is begotten, in the last analysis, of spiritual unrest and the shift or abandonment of religious convictions and ethical ideals. The interrelation between art and ethics being intimate and indissoluble, any change in the one is registered in the other sooner or later,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as certainly as a humor of the blood tells tales on the body's surface. Always in such a case the ethic of the time is to the art-expression as cause and effect. It is idle to pother with secondary causes when here is the native source. Our day is one of great religious upheaval, of the broadening and clarifying of ethical concepts, of personal as well as corporate re-adjustment of creeds and canons. To ask all this seethe of thought and emotion to leave no trace upon art, which is the expression of man's psychologic and spiritual life in terms of power and beauty, were like expecting the face of a maelstrom to be as calm and motionless as a shady pool in a trout-brook. Men and women of the time, under the stress of giving up old beliefs and the acceptance of new, are for the moment shaken, confused; some feel themselves afloat in a rudderless boat on a shoreless sea; others, though at first dazed, glimpse land ahead and keep a firm hand on the helm. And the elect of letters, especially those of the younger generation, in proportion to their depth and breadth, reflect these storm-signs, are sensitive to this barometer of the ethic weather.

Let us not dodge the fact: the morbid, the cynical, the naturalistic, and the decadent in our present-day literature,—all of this is, more than aught else, a sure emanation from the lack of faith and courage following on the loss (or at least change) of definite and canonical religious conviction. That it cannot always be traced to this efficient cause proves nothing; it is said that a mushroom will appear above the earth an eighth of a mile from the fungus wood whence it springs; yet dependent thereupon by a filament many times too small for seeing by the unaided human eye.

But it would be a false representation of our age and country to bear down on its intellectual struggle in this most important of thought-domains and omit to speak of its affirmative and altruistic side—the side of practical humanitarianism broader, more enlightened, more in the spirit of Christ, in short, than the world has before witnessed. The overthrow of letter-perfect Bible-infallibility will do good in the end and has already liberated people as well as dismayed them; while the great lesson that a life of good is far more to be desired than a hard and fast adherence to a conservative creed, begins to put forth lovely fruit in church and society. This spirit, too, is finding its strong expression in literature, and may be relied upon as a foil to the protuberant ugliness of the theory we are diagnosing. But this should not put us at ease with "art for art's sake." It is to literature what materialism is to thought; and no robing in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the splendors of Solomon can conceal the awful truth that death, not life, is in its person. Religion without spiritual activity is pithless formalism; art without spirituality (or ethical beauty, which I hold to be the same thing) is again a whited sepulchre, full of stinking bones.

It is not difficult to expose the fallacy of the creed which cries up manner as the be-all and end-all of art. A mere glance at world-literature proves beyond peradventure that the moving and permanent forces are those which are healthful, vital, positive, optimistic. Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Milton, and Browning are not decadents; men, all of them, cognizant of life's depths as well as heights, but never forgetting that accomplishment, aspiration, and peace are articulated into our living quite as truly as doubt, denial, and death. Hence these masters are open-air influences and a tonic to distraught humanity. The history of any puissant nation teaches the same thing; its athletic evolution and crest of power mean a literature which is bracing and splendid, its devolution a product into which the minor note has crept and through which runs the self-questioning of decay. All records yield an irresistible Yea to the query, Does not the decadent in literature (when sincere and not an affectation) always square with a similar state of social and intellectual life in the nation? To accept the poems, stories, and essays of the school in mind as legitimate and natural is to self-doom the country's career and pronounce its noble work done and its maturity past,—a claim so ridiculous as to be made only by a madman.

One may be allowed the shrewd suspicion that some of the decadent work of England in art and letters—for which such men as Oscar Wilde, George Moore, and Aubrey Beardsley are responsible—is the result of a self-conscious pose, not of a reasoned conviction or an impulse of the blood. The negative spirit in England is bad enough and sufficiently incongruous, but even if fit for one of the leading lands of Europe, would be peculiarly out of place here in the United States, forelooking to a great future. For American literature-makers to adopt—either consciously or unconsciously—the pessimism and dry-rot of France, Spain, Norway, and England, is an anachronism analogous to that which Greece might have furnished if, in the day of Pericles, she had taken of a sudden to the pensive idyls of Theocritus and the erotic epigrams of Meleager. Our land, entering into its young heyday of national maturity, must develop a literature to express and reflect its ideals, or we shall display to the astonished world the spectacle of a vigorous people, hardly out of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adolescence, whose voice is not the big, manly instrument suiting its years, but the thin piping treble of senility. Common sense and patriotism alike forbid such an absurdity.

Again, æsthetics and philosophy declare art for art's sake to be a silly lie. The confusion in the conceptions of a true æsthetic arises from a too exclusive devotion to the indubitable fact that art is primarily a matter of manner, of form. It were idle to deny that form is the imperative condition of the acceptability of any work of art; and, not unnaturally, the devotees of the current fallacy have jumped from this to the conclusion that form is everything, the only test of worth and rank being technique,—which is a palpable *non sequitur*. The so-called realists ignore (often, though not always) two potent elements in an art-creation lying at the base of any sound theory of æsthetics: to wit, taste and selection. Æsthetic taste decides what subject-matter comes within the purview of art, while the selective instinct chooses out the typical, relatively important phenomena which shall be reproduced in the magic peep-show of the artist. But taste is constantly and brutally violated by those who pride themselves on being veritists, on telling the truth at all hazards and about all things. The fiction of Guy de Maupassant, the poetry of Verlaine, and the plays of Hauptmann are in the way of spreading out before reader or auditor a dead-level of commonplace, or favoring a deification of minutiæ or a faithfulness in the transcription of vileness, as if art's crowning merit were the merit of the catalogue. Needless to say this is not a characterization of their work at large; but these are the pitfalls into which their theory leads them betimes. Taste is trampled upon in the creator's lust for photographic re-statement; not the moral nerves alone, but those that resent disgustful associations as the senses resent ill odors and discordant sounds, are outraged under the sacred name of Truth. Even were all this educative, the fact would remain that the æsthetic, which is the atmosphere of all artistic effort, is by this method made impossible.

Moreover, there is no reason for believing that the dreary repetition of palpably sorrowful and sickening data of life, too well apprehended already by poor humanity, is of use for either time or eternity. The greater need is an induction in a mood which rises superior to these antinomies, bracing up men for hopeful, manly work and, if so may be, for loving worship. It should be the purpose "of all good craftsmen," says J. A. Symonds, "not to weaken but to fortify, not to dispirit and depress, but to exalt and animate." And

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Robert Louis Stevenson, with the end-of-the-century literary product in mind, remarks with his wonted perception that "it would be a poor service to spread culture, if this be its result, among the comparatively innocent and cheerful ranks of men." If, as he adds, it be necessary nowadays to have "a great deal of puling over the circumstances in which we are placed," in Heaven's name, let it be done off the scenes, not in the presence of the audience.

In the inartistic indifference to selection, too, these *soi-disant* realists are guilty of a fatal mistake and overlook a fundamental requisite. The numbing of the æsthetic sensibilities so that offal is not recognized as such, can be understood as the slow result of pseudo-education; but the ignoring of proportion, of light and shade, of planes and values in the very professions which must learn these things as the A B C of their art, may be set down as an exhibition of stupidity. I use the hack-words of the painter, but with literature in view. To devote as much care and space and emphasis in a novel to the maunderings of a drunkard or the coquetries of a harlot, neither of whom represents cases of fallen and still fitfully re-emergent nobility, but both belong to the rank and file of ineffective and bourgeois sin,—to give such character-types more attention and accent than is bestowed upon those of larger bulk and more ideal significance, is an example of crass and vulgar misjudgment, and this entirely aside from all considerations of taste and *morale*. Du Maurier, in giving the world his "Trilby," gave it also an example of the true artist's handling of such a theme, teaching the noble lesson of ethical growth in the case of a *grisette* and so preserving moral balance in the depiction of Bohemian scenes and actions. Eliminate taste from art, and its corollary, the selective act of the artist in the midst of his raw material, and you reduce it to the methods of science and to the products of an unenlightened industry.

But philosophically, once more, the theory does not hold; if it is false æsthetics, it is also false psychology. Beauty is the one desideratum of all artistic creation; beauty in its broadest content, to include grandeur and the solemn effects following on the representation even of noble terror and sorrow. And Beauty, be it observed, is in all respectable philosophic analysis since Plato, not a quality confined within the domain of the æsthetic, but at root a spiritual thing. Plato in declaring the True, the Good, and the Beautiful to be phases of the one great principle, enunciated, once and for all, what Philosophy must but repeat; left a dictum not acceptable because the utter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ance of the great Greek, but because his were the insight and the imagination to grasp what is one of the inexpugnable verities of Thought.

It was this enlarging theory which Emerson never tired of championing; it was with this in his soul that Ruskin—prophet fallen upon evil days among younger schools who sneer at him as "literary"—said that two things enter into the greatness of a picture: first, the subject; second, the treatment; or, to re-phrase it, inspiration and technique,—and not technique alone. The beautiful in art, then, can no more be separated from ethics, from the spiritual, than can flesh and blood in the vital organism. Being the subtlest, most precious thing in art, it is to be above all else desired, striven for, and yearned after, and without it as an incentive and an ideal, the detail of a Meissonier or the metrical wonders of a Verlaine are of small avail. It offers, moreover, an infallible touchstone in the grading of all art-work. If there be no choice in the sort of life spread out by the artist, if the instinct of lust dissected with truth and power be as interesting, as intrinsically valuable and beautiful as the instinct of worship, then are all graduations destroyed and it is idle for man to struggle up out of his primeval apehood toward kinship with the angels. Thus stripped of ambiguity, few will refuse to grant the idiocy of this attitude; yet all who contend for art for art's sake implicitly put faith in the argument. To try to turn ethics out of art is as foolish as to sweep back the sea with a broomstick. Nature, driven out by the Horatian pitchfork, will surely return again, and healthy-minded humankind can never be cajoled by the cant of the ateliers into believing for a moment that deftness of flesh-tints or truthfulness in character-drawing are the equivalents of purity in artistic conception and the inspiration of the creative imagination.

The younger literary folk of the United States, then, are brought face to face with certain hard facts and are bidden choose. They may follow older lands, letting the popular theory of the day generate and guide their work, thereby laying themselves open to the charge of imitation, un-Americanism, false æsthetics and false psychology. Contrariwise, keeping a firm grip on the essential truth that a sound and efficient technique must bottom American literature as it must that of any and all lands, they may nevertheless have clear in sight the still broader and deeper verity that "beauty is truth, truth beauty," that in the ethic atmosphere only can the creative find its homeland and natural breathing-place, beauty being, in the words of Matthew Arnold, "truth seen from another side." We are aware

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that some critics, good men and true, having the best interests of our native literary- and art-production at heart, are fond of laying chief stress on the need of an unprovincial comparison of our work with other centres of civilization, in order to avoid a fatal self-sufficiency and the exclusive use of local standards—a kind of literary Chauvinism. And coincident with this they talk continually of technique and deem it our crying duty just now to ensure that, lest talent and enthusiasm run to waste. Their word has its share of truth, but in view of this infinitely graver menace implied in the acceptance of an illogical and soulless principle and method, sure if generally received to result in malformation in place of wholesome growth, it may well be ranked as of secondary importance. I believe heartily that our *littérateurs* are by comparison scot-free from the worst phases of the delusion; the work being done on all sides is vital and vigorous, and Mr. Howells was never more illuminative than in his critical *aperçus* recognizing the independent worth of our native product.

Indeed, the negative spirit, the cynic mood, and the manner of the realist or the pessimist belong, with us, rather to the critics than to the creators, the latter being as a class (though exceptions will occur to all) sound at heart and only eager to do work which shall be sane, broad, truthful, and wholesome. The criticism which continually depresses a fine young extravagance, which reiterates the sacerdotal function of art-minus-morals, and which sneers down admiration for local impulses and data, is not wanting in the United States. Though perhaps not representative, it exists, and so does a corresponding coterie among the literary folk themselves.

Returning to the original questions then, it may be said that what our writers are doing is endangered by what there is a temptation for them to believe; a temptation valiantly resisted in the main, but still present. An American literature such as is in mind, and which if true to our literary forebears we must make, shall be at once practical and ideal; practical, since it is the honest expression of national life and thought; ideal, for that it presents not facts alone but symbols, is not merely photographic but artistic by reason of its sensing the relative proportion of things and the all-important rôle of imaginative representation. Such a school of writers will beget poets and novelists who are also patriots, clasping clean and loyal hands and taking an inextinguishable joy in their work, which they hope shall be for the healing of the nation. And all the people will say, *Amen.*

RICHARD BURTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED